

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA


ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

CENTRAL
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

ACCESSION NO. 36584

CALL No. 954.022 Kis

TWILIGHT OF THE SULTANATE



TWILIGHT OF THE SULTANATE

A POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF
THE SULTANATE OF DELHI FROM THE INVASION OF
TIMUR TO THE CONQUEST OF HAHMIR 1398-1526

36584

by

KISHORI SARAN LAL

M.A., D. PHIL.

*Professor of History
Government Hamidia College
Bhopal, India*



954.022

Kis



ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · NEW DELHI · MADRAS
LUCKNOW · LONDON · NEW YORK

© KISHORI SARAN LAL
1963

NATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.
No. 36584
8-2-63
954.022 / Kis

PRINTED IN INDIA

BY Z. T. BANDUKWALA AT LEADERS PRESS
PRIVATE LIMITED, BOMBAY AND PUBLISHED BY
P. S. JAYASINGHE, ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, BOMBAY

PREFACE

AS I SAID in my *History of the Khaljis*,¹ the history of Pre-Mughal India has not received the attention it deserves, so that until now no monograph on the history of fifteenth century India has been brought out. The present work is an attempt to fill this long-felt gap in India's history.

However, while writing on the history of the Sultanate from Timūr to Bābur, one has to tread on difficult ground faced as one is with the glaring paucity of contemporary historical literature. The contemporary and nearly contemporary sources are indeed so few that it is necessary to study, howsoever briefly, their merits and defects to appreciate the difficulties of one who attempts to write on this period.

There are three works on the history of Timūr—all written outside India—while Indian annalists deal with his invasion in a very casual manner. The three chronicles forming the chief sources of Timūr's history are :

- (1) *Mulẓūzāt-i-Timūrī*, also called *Tuzuk-i-Timūrī* or Memoirs of Timūr,
- (2) *Zafar Nāmā* of Sharafuddīn Yazdī, and
- (3) *'Ajāibul Maqdūr fī Akhbār-i-Timūr* of Ahmad bin Arabshāh.

Timūr's Memoirs or *Mulẓūzāt* are considered to be apocryphal by many eminent authorities like Etche,² Rieu,³ Beveridge,⁴ Browne,⁵ and M. Bouyat.⁶ No original copy of this work in Turki exists, while about its translation rendered in Persian by Abu Tālib Husainī in the reign of Shāhjahān, E. G. Browne says: "It appears much more likely that he (Abu Tālib) himself compiled the Persian work...with the aid of *Zafar Nāmā*

¹ Published by the Indian Press, Allahabad, 1950.

² *India Office Catalogue of Persian MSS.*, Collection No. 84.

³ *British Museum Catalogue of Persian MSS.*, I, 178.

⁴ J.A.S.B., 1921, 201, 203.

⁵ E. G. Browne, *Literary History of Persia*, III, 183.

⁶ *Encyclopædia of Islam*, IV, 779.

Recd. from N/S Hindu Bazar, New Delhi, N.E. 2.5.53 (May 1953) -

and other histories of Tīmūr".⁷ But this assertion is very unfair to the author who claims to have obtained an original copy of the *Mulfūzāt* in Turki in the library of the ruler of Yemen when he was in Haramen (Ka'abā) on pilgrimage.⁸ Moreover the narrative of the *Mulfūzāt* is a corroborative of the other histories of Tīmūr that its substance proves its authenticity. However, Sharafuddīn Yazdī's *Zafar Nāmā* is perhaps the best source of Tīmūr's history. Although Yazdī wrote twenty years after the conqueror's death during the time of his grandson Ibrāhīm, and although his work is "prolix, tedious, florid and fulsome", yet he was present with the conqueror on some of his last campaigns. Besides, he bases his narrative probably on Nizām Shāmī's history of the same name.⁹ Nizām-i-Shāmī of Baghdād, who joined Tīmūr's court at the end of 1400, kept a daily record of the events of his reign,¹⁰ and this compilation in all probability provided source-material for Yazdī's work. Ahmad bin 'Arabshāh, the author of *'Ajāibul Maqdūr fi Akhbār-i-Tīmūr*, was carried a prisoner to Samarqand by Tīmūr. Therefore he is not a flatterer. Better still he is a truthful narrator of events.

Upon these three works, subsequent histories were written. Two of them, *Rauzatul Safā* by Mir Khwānd (died 1498) and *Habīb-us Siyar* by his grandson Khwānd Mīr (died 1525), are important. All these works taken together, especially the *Mulfūzāt* and the *Zafar Nāmā* of Yazdī, form a good source of material for the history of the conqueror. However, in the absence of any detailed Indian version, the narrative of Tīmūr's invasion of Hindustan as given by these foreign writers presents only a one-sided picture.

For the post-Tīmūr period, there is only one contemporary chronicle, the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī* written by Yahyā bin Sarhindī. It deals with the first thirty-five years of the Saiyyad dynasty. Although after the pattern of many other historians Yahyā starts with the foundations of Muslim rule in India, yet it

⁷ Browne, *op. cit.*, 184.

⁸ MS. belonging to Faujdār Muhammad Khan in the Azad Library, Bhopal.
2 (a).

⁹ Browne, *op. cit.*, 184 ff; Hodivala, 289-90.

¹⁰ The only copy of Shāmī's work, entitled *Zafar Nāmā* and completed in 1403-4 (806 H), is in the British Museum.

is for the period of 1400 to 1435 that he "gives us what he himself witnessed or learnt from trustworthy observers from the time of Firōz Shāh to the accession of the third Saiyyad Sultan, Muhammad". Thus he is "our most original authority" for a period of thirty-five years, 1400-1435.¹¹ With this he also supplements the meagre information of Shams Sirāj from about 1380 onwards. His account of the troublous times which followed the invasion of Timūr is detailed and accurate.

Yahyā is a conscientious and precise narrator of events.¹² Unlike other Persian historians, his style is exceedingly simple. His work abounds in dates. His chronology is correct. Although he wrote for a patron-king,¹³ he is no panegyrist. All later writers have been directly or indirectly indebted to him. The whole account of the Saiyyad period in Nizāmuddīn Ahmad's *Tabqāt-i-Akbarī* is a mere reproduction of the statements of *Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī*, very often copied verbatim. Badaonī follows it very closely. Ferishta often borrows its very words.

Although a single contemporary work on a long period of thirty five years is hardly satisfying, yet at least it is there. For the next three generations, in fact till the coming of Bābur, very little seems to have been written; at least nothing has survived. It appears that Sikandar Lodī kept a diary in which his scribes wrote an account of daily occurrences¹⁴ but that is not extant now. Again, although Ferishta claims to have consulted a contemporary work known as *Farhang-i-Sikandarī*, yet his account seems to be only a reproduction of the *Tabqāt-i-Akbarī*, and for the history of the period from 1435 right up to 1526 one has to depend only on secondary sources.

There are, however, two writers who were almost contemporary with the Lodī rulers. One is Rizqulla who was born in the reign of Sikandar Lodī (1491) and was thirty-six years of age when Ibrāhīm Lodī died at Panipat.¹⁵ But his work, entitled *Waqi'āt-i-Mushtāqī*, was written long after, in 980 H. (A. D. 1572-73). Besides, it is frequently interrupted by digressions and anecdotes.

¹¹ J.N.Sarkar, Foreword to *Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī's* translation by K.K. Basu, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1932.

¹² Thomas, *Chronicles*, 330.

¹³ T.M.S., Bib. Ind. text (Calcutta 1931), Foreword, 1.

¹⁴ T.D., 99.

¹⁵ He lived from m. D. 1491 to A. D. 1581 (897-989 H). *Akhbār al Akhyār*, 174.

and, therefore, is not a first rate work. All the same it is almost a contemporary account. The other writer is the celebrated saint 'Abdul Haqq Dehelvi. He was a nephew of Rizqulla. His *Tārīkh-i-Haqqī* (1596) gives useful information about the Lodi dynasty. What he writes about the Lodis, he learnt from actual eye witnesses or from hearsay.¹⁶

Of the later writers the most important is Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, author of the *Tabqāt-i-Akbarī*,¹⁷ a history from the first appearance of Muhammadanism in India up to the date of its composition in 1002 H (A.D. 1593-94). It is a very important source-book for the history of the Saiyyad and Lodi rulers. Nizāmuddīn Ahmad must have consulted some contemporary works, not available now. Abdul Qādir Badaonī, Ferishta and Nihāwandī, the author of *Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī*, also deal at length with the history of the Lodi period.

Then there are works dealing particularly with the Lodi kings though written at a later date. One such is the *Tārīkh-i-Salātin-i-Afghān* also known as *Tārīkh-i-Shāhī* written by Ahmad Yādgār.¹⁸ Yādgār's father was Vazīr of the Mughal prince Mirza 'Askari, and the author describes himself as an old servant of Sūr Kings. He commences his work with the accession of Bahlūl (1451) and the last chapter deals with the defeat and capture of Hēmd (1556). The work was written at the command of Sultan Dāūd Shāh of Bengal. The author shows scant regard for dates and "at the end of the reign of each Afghan king gives fanciful and sometimes absurd stories".¹⁹

Ni'amatulla's *Makhsan-i-Afghānī* was written in the seventeenth century in Jahāngīr's reign. It is a general history of the Afghans from the time of Adam to the death of Khwājā 'Usmān (1612). A distinctive feature of this book is the geneological account of various Afghan tribes. The *Tārīkh* contains, in addition, a memoir on Khan-i-Jahān Lodi, one of the greatest generals of Jahāngīr

¹⁶ For a note on the work see the British Museum *Catalogue of Persian MSS.*, I, 223. For a life sketch of the author see Badaonī, III, 3.

¹⁷ For a notice of his life see *Ma'āsir-i 'Umarī* and *Muntahab-ul-Tawārikh*. For a notice of his work see *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, I, 220 ff.

¹⁸ M. Hidāyat Husain editor of the Bibliotheca Indica text, Calcutta, 1939, prefers this ■■■■■. Preface, v.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, vii-viii.

from whom the book takes its name.²⁰ The author was a Waqia Nawis at the court of Jahāngīr. He was a contemporary of Ferishta (though he does not mention this anywhere in his work), and commenced his work in the year in which Ferishta finished his, 1593 (1001-2 H). Ni'amatulla was assisted in his work by one Haibat Khan of Samana. Like Ahmad Yādgar, Ni'amatulla too has little regard for dates and is fond of marvellous stories.

Another work of the seventeenth century is the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī* written by 'Abdulla. It deals with the Lodī and Sūr dynasties.²¹ It is deficient in dates and gives many anecdotes. It bears no date but incidentally mentions Jahāngīr, who ascended the throne in 1605. The work is on the whole disjointed and fragmentary.

Such is the position of chief official histories. The Rajput accounts too are not rich in detail and freely mix fiction with fact. But the works of the religious reformers of the fifteenth century give a good insight into the social life of the period, and the itineraries of foreign travellers like Athanasius Nikitin, 'Abdur Razzāq, Nicolo Conti and Santo Stefano contain an instructive account of the social and economic life of the fifteenth century. The *Memoirs of Bābur* is a good source-book for the political and social conditions obtaining in the early sixteenth century.

The absence of contemporary works is certainly a handicap. But the nearly coeval and later works, which must have been based on contemporary sources, fill up the gap to a good extent. Muslims were excellent chroniclers; the works of Nizāmuddin and Ferishta would compare favourably even with modern histories. That being so, a judicious study of the material available does bring out the main currents of fifteenth century history.

My study of the times has led me to certain conclusions. They have been discussed in detail in their proper places, and need not be reproduced here. Two points, however, may be emphasised. Firstly, Timūr's invasion, which is rightly regarded as a terrible calamity, was not without a silver lining. It taught the Hindus and the Muslims to stand together in the face of a foreign foe. The urge for unity grew a time advanced. It found its culmination

²⁰ For a note on the work see E & D, V, 68. Also *Islamic Culture*, XXII, 1948, 128-42; 280-94. I.H.C., 1941, 377-83.

²¹ E & D, V and British Museum Catalogue, I, 242-43.

in the teachings of the socio-religious reformers of the fifteenth-sixteenth century. The yearning for Hindu-Muslim rapprochement is the burden of the fifteenth century social history. Secondly, despite the political instability almost throughout the whole of this period of one century and a quarter, there was sustained progress in all spheres of social and cultural activity.

I am indebted to the Director of Archaeology in India, New Delhi, for the facilities he provided for my study at the excellent library of the Archaeological Department. The Secretary, Oriental Public Library, Patna, was equally helpful. Dr. Raghuvir Singh was kind enough to lend me the photo-print copies of the *Waqi'at-i-Mushtaqi* of the British Museum MS. Add. 11, 633 and of the *Tawārikh-i-Majlis-Arāi* by Ibrāhīm Batani of the British Museum MS. Add. 21, 911. The latter is an enlarged version of 'Abbās Sherwānī's *Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhi*, but so far as the Lodi period is concerned it is almost a verbatim reproduction of the genuine *Makhzan-i-Afghāni*. Therefore, wherever Batani's work is quoted in evidence for the Lodi Sultans, it is cited as *Makhzan*.

I am extremely grateful to my revered professor Dr. Tara Chand for suggesting this topic for my study and never grudging to spare time to help and advise. Dr. ■, P. Saksena, Head of the History Department, Allahabad University, was kind enough to go through the MS. and give valuable suggestions. I must also thank my colleagues, Mr. S. H. Jafri for typing out the MS., Mr. T. S. Bapna for helping me to check the proofs and Mr. Manazir Ahmad, Mr. Radhey Saran and Mr. M. H. Rizawi for preparing the Index.

In the transliteration of Persian and Indian words, long vowels are indicated as ā ī ū. Well-known words like Khan and Sultan are not accented. Similarly where h in a final position is silent (as in Ferishtah) it has been dropped to help in the correct pronunciation of the word. Thus Ferishtah, Battūtah and Zilhijjāh have been written as Ferishta, Battūta and Zilhijjā.

The title of the work has been adapted from Percival Spear's *Twilight of the Mughals* (Cambridge, 1951).

K. S. LAL

October 1962

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN REFERENCES FOR TITLES OF WORKS

A.G.I.	<i>Ancient Geography of India</i> by Cunningham.
A.F.	<i>Afzal-ul-Fawā'id</i> by Amīr Khusrū.
Āin.	<i>Āin-i-Akbarī</i> by Abul Fazl.
A.N.	<i>Akbar Nāmā</i> by Abul Fazl.
Alqal.	<i>Subb-ul-A'sha</i> by al-Qalqashindī.
Arch. Sur. Rep.	<i>Archaeological Survey of India Report.</i>
Asar.	<i>Āsar-us-Sanādāt</i> by Saiyyad Ahmad Khan.
Badaoni.	<i>Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh</i> by 'Abdul Qādir Badaoni.
B.N.(B).	<i>Bābur Nāmā</i> or <i>Memoirs of Bābur</i> translated by Mrs. Beveridge.
B.N. (L & E)	<i>Bābur Nāmā</i> trans. by Leyden and Erskine.
C.H.I.	<i>Cambridge History of India.</i>
Chronicles.	<i>Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi</i> by Edward Thomas.
C.I.S.G.	<i>Central India States Gazetteer.</i>
E & D.	<i>History of India as Told by its Own Historians</i> by Elliot and Dowson.
E.I.	<i>Epigraphia Indica.</i>
Epi.-Indo-Mos.	<i>Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica.</i>
Ind. Ant.	<i>Indian Antiquary.</i>
I.B.	<i>The Rihla of Ibn Battūta</i> trans. by Dr. Mehdi Husain.
I.G.	<i>Imperial Gazetteer of India.</i>
I.H.C.	<i>Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.</i>
J.I.H.	<i>Journal of Indian History.</i>
J.(P)A.S.B.	<i>Journal (and Proceedings) of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.</i>
J.B.B.R.A.S.	<i>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.</i>
J.R.A.S.	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Britain.</i>
List.	<i>List of the Muhammadan & Hindu Monuments.</i>
Makhzan.	<i>Makhzan-i-Afghānī</i> by Ni'amatulla.
M.R.	<i>Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī</i> by Abdul Bāqī Nihāwandī.
M.T.	<i>Mulfuzāt-i-Timūrī.</i>
R.Q.	<i>Rahat-ul-Qulūb</i> by Shaikh Nizāmuddin Auliya.
R.S.	<i>Rausat-us-Safā</i> by Mir Khwānd.
S.A.	<i>Siyarul Auliya</i> by Mir Khurīd.
T.A.	<i>Tabqāt-i-Akbarī</i> by Nizāmuddin Ahmad.
Tab. Nas.	<i>Tabqāt-i-Nāsiri</i> by Minhājuddin Sirāj.
T.M.S.	<i>Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī</i> by Yahyā.
T.D.	<i>Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī</i> by 'Abdulla.
T.F.S.(A)	<i>Tārīkh-i-Fīroz Shāhī</i> by Shams Sirāj 'Alī.
T.F.S.(B)	<i>Tārīkh-i-Fīroz Shāhī</i> by Ziyāuddin Baranī.
T.S.A.	<i>Tārīkh-i-Salāṭin-i-Afghānā</i> by Ahmad-Yādgār.
W.M.	<i>Waqiāt-i-Mushtāqī</i> by Rizqulla.
Z.N.	<i>Zafar Nāmā</i> by Sharafuddin Yardi.
Z.W.	<i>Zafarul Waṭnī</i> by Hājī Dabīr.

CONTENTS

1	A DECADE OF DECLINE	1
	Death of Firōz Shāh Tughlaq 1; Muhammad ■ 5; Mahmūd Shāh ■	
2	VISITATION OF A SCOURGE	14
	March into Hindostan 16; Through the Punjab 17; To- Delhi 23; Battle of Delhi 27; Sack of Delhi 30; Meerut and Hardwar 31; The Return Journey 35; Visitation in Retrospect 41	
3	BID FOR THE THRONE	44
	Iqbāl Khan 44; Mahmūd Shāh Once More 54; Khizr Khan 57; The Sultanate <i>vis-à-vis</i> Other States 60	
4	REVENUE THROUGH BAYONET	70
	Khizr Khan's Early Career 70; Struggle for Establishment of Sovereignty 73; Pseudo-Sārang and Tughān Rāis 79; A Resumé of Khizr Khan's Work 82	
5	THE PUNJAB IN TURMOIL	84
	Jasrat Khokhar 84; Fawā'id Turkbachchā and Shaikh 'Alī 90; Anarchical Situation 95	
6	THE PROBLEM TRACT	101
	Katehar-Bayana-Mewat-Doab 101; Jaunpur 106; Murder of Mubārak Shāh 110	
7	AZ DEHLI TĀ PĀLAM	114
	Muhammad Shāh 114; 'Ālam Shāh 123; The Saiyyad Dynas- ty 128	
8	PRIMUS INTER PARES	131
	Early Career of Bahlūl Lodi 131; War with the Sharqis 134; Extinction of the Sharqi Kingdom 144; Other Exploits of Bahlūl 153; Bahlūl Lodi — An Estimate 157	

9	EFFORTS AT STABILITY	162
	Suppression of Rivals 163; The Bachgotts 167; The Baghelas of Rewa 169; The Tomars of Gwalior 173; Relations with Malwa 180; An Estimate of Sikandar Lodi 185; Why Is Sikandar Lodi Known as a Bigot? 190	
10	THE SULTANATE UNDER IBRĀHIM LODI	195
	Civil War 198; Conquest of Gwalior 205; Ibrāhim and Rana Sāngā 209; Nobles in Revolt 211; Bābur's Invasion of Hindustan 216; Battle of Panipat 222	
11	CULTURAL ACTIVITY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY	227
	Architecture 227; Music and Painting 241; Promotion of Learning 244; Persian Literature 246; Arabic Works 249; Sanskrit Literature 250; Development of Regional Languages 252; General Remarks 256	
12	SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE	257
	Rural Life 257; Urban Life 260; The Elite 261; The Commoners 265; Position of Women 268; Dress 270; Food and Drink 272; Industry, Trade and Commerce 277; Bābur's Impressions of City Life 284; Towards One Nation 286	
13	AN AGE OF SOCIO-RELIGIOUS REFORMERS	291
	Rāmānanda 293; Sant Kabir 294; Other Disciples of Rāmānanda 299; Gurū Nānak 300; Vallabhacharya 305; Chaitanya 307; Conclusion 311	
	APPENDIXES	
	A Timur's Massacre of the Indian Prisoners 319; B Jasrat Khokhar's Stronghold 321; C Origin of the Lodis 323; D Garha Katanga 331	
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	333
	INDEX	343

Chapter I

A DECADE OF DECLINE

THE FIRST THREE centuries of Turkish rule in India exhibit a similarity to the course of human life with its three stages of birth and adolescence, vigorous youth, and crabbed old age. During the first century the Empire established by men like Muhammad Ghori and Qutbuddin Aibak was nourished and nurtured by men like Iltutmish and Balban (1200-1290). In its period of youth (1290-1380) it was consolidated and strengthened by rulers like 'Alāuddīn Khaljī, Muhammad Tughlaq and Firōz. Then came old age. It had just set in when Timūr's invasion (1398) struck it like palsy; thereafter for half a century the Sultanate began to live as if on crutches. It showed some signs of recovery under the Lodis (1451-1526); but that was like the last flicker of the dying lamp. Bābur's guns at Panipat sounded its death-knell.

It is with this last phase of the Sultanate (1398-1526), that the following pages will deal. The history of this period of a century and a quarter is full of interest since it provides the curious spectacle of two rival forces operating simultaneously. In the political sphere it is a period of disintegration and decay, while in the social and cultural spheres it is an age of sustained progress and great achievements.

Death of Firōz Shāh Tughlaq

The process of political disintegration had commenced during the reign of Firōz Tughlaq himself (1351-1388). He failed to reclaim the Deccan and frittered away his energies in fruitless campaigns in far-off regions—Orissa, Nagarkot and Thatta—without being able to add a patch of territory to his shrunken empire. His revival of the Jāgirs and enrolment of an army of slaves destroyed the merits of the reforms of the Khaljis and strengthened the forces of disorder. In his zeal for piety he lightened punishments and thereby encouraged corruption in administration and inefficiency in the army.¹

¹ T.F.S. (A), 303, 344-45.

To these unhappy circumstances was added an element of misfortune. During his last days he lost his faculties of decision, and after his death a ten years' war of succession made confusion worse confounded. To have a clear picture of the condition of the Sultanate on the eve of Tīmūr's invasion, it would be pertinent to make a detailed study of this decade of decline (1388-1398).

Firōz Tughlaq "attained deliverance from the tortures of existence" on Sunday, 20 September, 1388 (18 Ramzān, 790H)², and was buried near the Hauz-i-Khās. Because of loss of faculties some time before his death at the age of 81,³ Prince Muhammad had assumed regal authority with the title of Nāsiruddīn Muhammad Shāh.⁴ But his incompetence and acts of injustice made the old dying Sultan nominate his grandson, prince Tughlaq Shāh, son of his elder son Fateh Khan, as his successor. On Firōz's death Tughlaq Shāh ascended the throne with the title of Sultan Ghayāsuddīn.

Ghayāsuddīn's first task was to strike at his disestablished uncle who was restless with discontent. He sent his Vazīr, Khwājā Jahān and Bahadur Nābar, a converted Rajput from Mewat and a prominent figure in the Delhi politics, to the hills of Sirmur to which Muhammad had fled, but the latter escaped to Suket and therefrom to Nagarkot, about a hundred miles north of the town of Sirmur.⁵ But while Muhammad was still unsubdued and utmost caution was called for on the part of Ghayāsuddīn, the latter, being young and inexperienced, gave himself up to wine and debauchery. And when he imprisoned his real brother Salār Shāh for no ostensible reason,⁶ his cousin Abū Bakr, son of Zafar Khan and grandson of Firōz, rose against him, murdered the Sultan and the Vazīr and himself ascended the throne — 19 February, 1389 (21 Safar, 791 H).⁷

To profit by these kaleidoscopic changes the Amīrān-i-Sadah⁸

² T.M.S., 140. Badaoni has 16 Ramzān, Ferishta 3 Ramzān.

³ Badaoni (I, 253; Ranking, I, 336) and Ferishta (I, 150) say that he was more than 90 at the time of his death. According to 'Alif he was born in 707 H (A.D. 1307-8). At the time of his death he must have been in his 84th lunar and 81st solar year. C.H.I., III, 184, gives his age as 83, but that must be lunar.

⁴ T.M.S., 138-40. ⁵ Badaoni, I, 258. ⁶ T.M.S., 143. ⁷ *Ibid.*, 143.

⁸ The Amīrān-i-Sadah find mention in the Tughlaq times. These officers seem to have combined civil and military functions. They collected revenue

or Centurions of Samana, lying immediately to the north of the capital, invited Muhammad Shāh to make another attempt to capture the throne. The latter started from Nagarkot and marching via Jalandhar arrived at Samana, where he crowned himself a second time as the Sultan in April, 1389 (Rabiul Ākhir, 791 H).⁹ Some discontented Delhi nobles also joined him there and he started for Delhi with twenty thousand horse, which swelled to fifty thousand on the way. On occasions like these the riff-raff used to join contending armies for the love of plunder;¹⁰ for others also it was safe to be in the army than to be a mere spectator and a probable victim of its banditry.¹¹ Because of his large army, Muhammad was enabled to occupy the palace of Jahān Nūmā without any opposition, but at the palace of Firōzābād the combined forces of Sultan Abū Bakr and Bahadur Nāhar inflicted on him a crushing defeat — 29 April, and forced him to flee with barely 2,000 men.¹²

Though defeated in battle, Muhammad — not defeated in spirit. He retreated into the Doab, made Jalesar¹³ his headquarters, and began preparations for another war to wrest the crown. He sent his son Humayūn Khan to Samana to enrol fresh troops. Chiefs in the vicinity of Samana such as Malik Ziyāul Mulk and Malik Kamāluddīn Maīn were already with him. Now some other important nobles like the Shahnā (Superintendent) of Delhi, and the governors of Multan, Bihar, Avadh, and Qannauj, together with Rai Sumnēr of Etawah and many other Rais joined him. He gave them titles and honours befitting their positions. Malik Sarwar, the Shahnā of Delhi, was made the Vazīr and given the title of Khwājā Jahān. Nasīrul Mulk, the Governor of Multan, was given the title of Khizr Khan (by which he was afterwards to be known — the founder of the Saiyyad Dynasty). Khawāsul Mulk, the

and each had — hundred men under his command. They — Indians — well as foreigners—neo-Muslims or Mongol converts, Turks and Afghans. Like all medieval adventurers they were ever ready to profit by the difficulties of the Sultanate, and their rebellions were a chronic feature of the Tughlaq times. T.F.S. (B), 495; T.A., I, 215; Bayley: *Gujarat*, 43. Also Ind. Ant., XXVIII, 142; Ishwari Prasad, *Garaunaḥ Turks*, 208-9 n.

⁹ T.M.S., 146; T.A., I, 243. ¹⁰ T.F.S. (A), 289.

¹¹ T.F.S. (A), 112, 122. ¹² T.M.S., 146; Ferishta, I, 152.

¹³ In Etah district, U.P., 38 miles east of Mathura. In Akbar's time this pargana — inhabited by Gūhilot Rajputs. Hunter, *Imp. Gaz.*, VII, 103.

Governor of Bihar, was made Khawās Khan and Saifuddin became Saif Khan. Thus in the imminent civil war the whole of northern India became involved.

Having collected a force of fifty thousand horse and "innumerable" foot¹⁴ Nāsiruddin Muhammad once again marched towards Delhi in July-August, 1389 (Sh'abān, 791 H).¹⁵ He met the army of Abū Bakr near the village of Kandli, about 46 miles north-east of Delhi.¹⁶ "There were heavy casualties on both sides,"¹⁷ but in the end Muhammad was defeated. Shortly afterwards his son Humayūn, who had arrived from Samana, was also beaten back at Panipat.¹⁸ But in spite of these discomfitures, Muhammad's authority was acknowledged in Multan, Lahore, Samana, Hansi, Hisār Firōzā and most of the districts to the north of Delhi. He cleared these districts of all disaffected elements by ordering the massacre of Firōz Shāhī slaves there. Consequently in most of these places blood-baths took place, houses were burnt down and roads closed for traffic. Taking advantage of this confusion in which stable government had ceased to exist, the zamindars of the countryside withheld the payment of taxes.¹⁹

Tired of constant warfare and encouraged by his recent victories, Abū Bakr decided to fight to a finish. He marched against Muhammad Shāh towards Jalesar in April-May, 1390 (Jamādīul Avval, 792 H).²⁰ He had hardly gone 30 miles (20 *kurohs*) when Muhammad with 4,000 light-horse arrived by another route at Delhi, stormed the Badaon Gate and entered the city. Abū Bakr returned to Delhi in all haste and chased Muhammad out. In these bloody conflicts the people suffered acutely. Muhammad did little to defend the inhabitants of Jalesar, and the population of Firōzshād, Delhi and the Doab suffered terribly during this civil war.

Successful in battle, Abū Bakr fell a victim to treachery. In the month of August some noblemen turned against him "without any ostensible reason",²¹ and opened communications with Muham-

¹⁴ T.M.S., 146-47. ¹⁵ T.M.S., 147; T.A., I, 244.

¹⁶ Kandli is most probably modern Kandhla, situated about 46 miles north-east of Delhi on the Delhi-Saharanpur Light Railway. It is in Sarkar Delhi, Sūba Delhi. *Ann. Trs.*, II, 287.

¹⁷ Ferishta, I, 132.

¹⁸ Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 343; T.A., I, 245.

¹⁹ T.M.S., 147; T.A., I, 245.

²⁰ T.M.S., 148; T.A., I, 245.

²¹ T.M.S., 149; T.A., I, 246.

maḍ Shāh. This so much unnerved Abū Bakr that he fled to Bahadur Nāhar's Kotla, about 8 miles south of Nūh in Gurgaon district.²² His officers, left at the mercy of Muhammad, readily joined the latter who marched into Delhi and ascended the throne (a third time) at the palace of Firōzābād on 31 August, 1390 (19 Ramzān).²³ Many Firōz Shāhī nobles and officers loyal to Abū Bakr left for the Kotla to join him there. Muhammad found it a good opportunity to finish all the "impure rebels" who like the Egyptian guards had put the crown into commission and behaved like virtual king-makers.²⁴ Some of them managed to escape, but all others ——— massacred in cold blood. This struck terror into the hearts of the Delhi people, and stabilised Muhammad Shah's position.

Sultan Muhammad now felt strong enough to crush Abū Bakr completely. In December, 1390 (Muharram, 793 H)²⁵ he sent his Vazīr, Islām Khan, and Prince Humayūn against Abū Bakr and they defeated the latter at the village of Mahindwārī.²⁶ Meanwhile Muhammad himself arrived with reinforcements at the Kotla and compelled Abū Bakr and Bahadur Nāhar to surrender. Bahadur was pardoned, but Abū Bakr was sent a prisoner to Meerut where he died shortly after.²⁷

Muhammad Shāh

On his return to Delhi, Sultan Muhammad gave his attention to the affairs of the State. Constant strife ever since the death of Firōz Tughlaq had weakened the Sultanate considerably; and its authority was challenged everywhere. Firōz Shāhī slaves had been done away with; but there arose other centrifugal forces. Gujarat was far away and planning independence, Mewat was restive and the Punjab contumacious. The east was gradually slipping out, and the Doab was defying the central authority

²² Elliot, *Races*, II, 100. Nūh is shown in Constable, 27 Ca. The Kotta is mentioned as the ——— of a fortified town in Tijārī in *Āin*, Tra., II, 193. Also Hodivala, 393.

²³ Ferishta, I, 153; T.A., I, 246.

²⁴ Ferishta, I, 153.

²⁵ T.M.S., 151.

²⁶ Probably modern Mandawar in Alwar situated about 40 miles south-west of Kotla. Hodivala, 393-94.

²⁷ T.M.S., 151; Ferishta, I, 153.

Muhammad Shah took stock of the situation and determined to reassert his authority.

Early in the year A. D. 1391 (793 H) news was received of the recalcitrance of Nizām Shāh, the governor of Gujarat. Appointed to its charge in A. D. 1375-76 (777 H)²⁸ by Firōz Shāh, Farhatul Mulk, also known as Nizām Shāh Mufarraḥ, seems to have been very popular with his Hindu subjects.²⁹ This was sufficient cause for the "Ulema and the learned" to complain against him. Worse still he had also not sent any revenue to Delhi for some time.³⁰ This was a matter for concern, and Muhammad Shāh nominated Zafar Khan, son of Wajihul Mulk, to replace Mufarraḥ in Gujarat.³¹ Zafar Khan left for Gujarat with a large army in March, 1391 (Rabi'us Sānī, 793 H). Mufarraḥ could hardly submit to this injustice, and with a force of ten to twelve thousand he met Zafar Khan at the village of Kamboi, situated at about 20 miles west of Anhilwara, but he was defeated and killed.³² Zafar Khan entered Neherwala and started on a reign of peace and prosperity.³³

Nearer home Sultan Muhammad was grappling with the chiefs of the Doab with a view to bringing them to obedience. Important amongst these were Rai Vira Singh,³⁴ the Tomar chief of Gwalior, his younger brother Rāwat Uddhāran Singh, Rai Sumēr of Etawah³⁵ and Ranvir Vāhan of Mainpuri. Firōz Tughlaq had marched

²⁸ Nizām [] was appointed [] the governor of Gujarat in 777 H [] [] proved by the discovery of an inscription published in *Epi. Indo-Mos.*, 1939-40, I, and not in 778 H as asserted by Yahya and Ferishta. *T.M.S.*, 131-33.

²⁹ Ferishta, II, 178.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 179.

³¹ *T.A.*, I, 247; Badaoni, I, 262; Ferishta, I, 153; II, 178. Also *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 46.

³² *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 47.

³³ Ferishta, II, 179.

³⁴ Yahya calls him Bar Singh, Badaoni has Har Singh and Nizāmuddin and Ferishta have Nar Singh. But none of them is correct. His real name was Vira Singh as contained in the dynastic list of the Tomar rulers of Gwalior. The list is based on epigraphical records existing in Rohtas and Narwar. *J.A.S.B.*, VIII, 693; XXXI, 404. Cunningham, *Arch. Sur. Rep.*, II, 304.

³⁵ *T.M.S.*, 134, 169 has Rai Sabir. Ferishta has Sarwar which is also adopted in *C.H.I.*, III, 205, 207.

Neither of these names is correct. He was the Chouhan Raja Sumēr Singh of Etawah and [] name is preserved in the dynastic list of the Chauhans. Strangely enough in Ferishta's Urdu translation (I, 246, 247) the correct name Sumēr (سمر) is given.

According to local tradition, Sumēr Singh is said to have founded the

against Sumēr and Uddhāran in A. D. 1377-78 (779 H), and they with their families were taken to Delhi and forced to reside there. In the court Sumēr and Uddhāran used to sit behind Zafar Khan junior and Āzam Khan Khurasānī, not like them ■ ■ carpet but on the bare ground.³⁸ They had put up with this humiliation during the reign of Firōz, but now finding the Sultanate weak, they not only declared their independence but also occupied the *pargana* of Balārām³⁷ in Etah district, and some other *parganas* in its vicinity. Sultan Muhammad could not put up with this affrontery. He sent the Vazīr against Vira Singh and himself marched to Etawah against Sumēr and Uddhāran. Vira Singh ■ ■ defeated and carried to Delhi, but Sumēr and Uddhāran entrenched themselves in Etawah, fought a bloody battle for thirty-six hours, and in the end escaped from the fort at night. Muhammad dismantled the fortifications of Etawah³⁹ and then marched to Qannauj and Dalmaū, striking at the recalcitrant zamindars on the way, and thence to Jalesar. Since Jalesar had brought him good luck, he ordered the construction of a fort there and christened the place Muhammadābād.

The Sultan returned to Delhi rather in haste in June, 1392 (Rajjab, 795 H).⁴⁰ He had been informed by Malik Sarwar, who bore a grudge against Islam Khan for having lost the Vazarat to him, that the latter was planning a revolt. After ■ summary and unsatisfactory investigation Islam Khan was put to death on the evidence of only one witness, his own nephew Jājū.⁴¹ Thereupon Malik Sarwar Khwājā Jahān was once again elevated to the office of Vazīr.

The Sultan's last devastating campaign in western Uttar Pradesh had left bitter memories behind. No sooner was he back in Delhi

Chouhan house of Partabnēr, which lies six miles west of Etawah. The Rajas of Mainpuri claim him as their ancestor, and he ■ said to have built the fort of Etawah. U.P. Gazetteer, Bd. 1908, XI (Etawah), 129, 206, 220. Hodivala, 392, 394-5, 397.

³⁸ T.F.S. (A), 281; T.M.S., 133-34; Ferishta, I, 148; Z.W., III, 898.

³⁹ It was a Mahal in Sarkar Kol, Sūba Agra, in the days of Akbar. It is now in Kasgunj Tehsil, Etah district. Ain. Tra., II, 186; I.G., XV, 69. The place is indicated in Constable, Pl. 27 Db.

⁴⁰ T.M.S., 152; Badsoni, I, 262; T.A., 248; Ferishta, I, 153.

⁴¹ T.M.S., 152.

⁴² T.M.S., 153; Ferishta, I, 153. Also Hodivala, 395-96.

than Sumēr and Uddhāran reoccupied Etawah. Nay, even many neighbouring zamindars like Ajit Singh Rathor of Rampur (District Etah), Narvīr Vāhan (Bīr Bhān of the chronicles),⁴¹ the Chouhan Raja of Bhongaon (near Mainpuri)⁴² and Abhai Chandra (Bhadaoria) the chief of Chandwār (near Fīrōzābād)⁴³ also joined their cause. The Sultan ordered Malik Muqgarabul Mulk, the governor of Jalesar, to march against Etawah. Finding his task formidable, Muqgarab preferred perfidy to a show of arms. He enticed all the aforementioned zamindars to accompany him to Qannauj to finalise the terms of a truce, and there got every one of them murdered except Rai Sumēr who managed to escape to Etawah.⁴⁴ Muqgarab returned to Muhammadābād (Jalesar) in a triumphant mood.

Meanwhile trouble was brewing in Mewat, where Bahadur Nāhar, who had ever opposed Muhammad, had risen in revolt and had made inroads into the environs of Delhi.⁴⁵ Notwithstanding his illness the Sultan proceeded in a palanquin to the Kotla of Bahādur Nāhar. The latter shut himself in his fortress and Muhammad could achieve little. He was still in feeble health when he returned to Jalesar, but only to learn that Shaikha Khokhar had risen in revolt at Lahore. He wrote to Humayūn Khan to march against the Khokhar chief, but just as the Prince was about to leave, the Sultan breathed his last on 20 January, 1394 (17 Rabiul Awwal). His remains were taken to Delhi and interred at the Hauz-i-Khās.⁴⁶

Mahmūd Shāh

Prince Humayūn succeeded his father as Sultan Sikandar Shāh, but he also died within a couple of months. Thereupon Muhammad's

⁴¹ T.M.S., 153; T.A., I, 248; Ferishta, I, 153-54. Bīr Bhān may safely be identified with Rambīrbhān or Ranvīr Vāhan which name occurs in the dynastic list of the Rajas of Mainpuri. U.P. Gazetteer, Ed. 1876, IV, 370.

⁴² About ten miles from Mainpuri town, a Mahāl with a fort (Ām., II, 195). Tradition attributes the founding of Bhongaon to Raja Bhīm. I.G., VIII, 40-41; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 386 and n. 3. Also Hodivala, 406.

⁴³ Chandwār lies on the left bank of the Jumna, 8 miles S. W. of Fīrōzābād and about 10 miles E.S.S. of Agra. J.R.A.S., 1905, 240.

⁴⁴ He lived up to A.D. 1421 and gave a lot of trouble to the Sultanate as long as he lived.

⁴⁵ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 347; T.A., I, 249; Ferishta, I, 154.

⁴⁶ T.M.S., 154.

youngest son Mahmūd, a lad of barely ten years, ascended the throne on 23 March, 1394, with the title of Sultan Nāsiruddīn Mahmūd Shāh. The people were naturally sceptical about his capacity to rule,⁴⁷ but the boy-king proved to be quite precocious and from the very beginning he dealt effectively with the disturbed state of the country. Of late his predecessors had been completely preoccupied with the affairs of Mawat and the Doab. Consequently the eastern region of Jaunpur and beyond had gone out of control on account of the turbulence of the Hindu zamindars. Therefore, the Sultan conferred on Khwājā Jahān the title of Malikul Sharq "and appointed him governor of Hindustan from Qannauj to Bihar devolving upon him full powers and uncontrolled authority"⁴⁸ to bring the region under control. At the same time he sent Sārang Khan to Deopapur to restore order in the west.

Malikul Sharq marched towards the east in May, 1394 (Rajjab, 796 H), punishing the recalcitrant zamindars of Etawah, Kol, Khor, Kampil and Qannauj on the way. He made Jaunpur his headquarters⁴⁹ and brought into subjection important places like Kara, Sandilah, Dalmaū, Bahraich and Tirhut.⁵⁰ For the time

ماںی گرفت کرد ده ساله ای عیب Whata wonder! A lad of ten got a kingdom. *Tarikh-i-Haqiqi*, Bankipore MS., 29(b).

⁴⁷ According to Badaoni he was given the title of Sultanus Sharq, while according to Ferishta that of Malikul Sharq. Yahya also has Sultanus Sharq. It appears, however, that the title given was Malikul Sharq only, and when Khwājā Jahān strengthened his position on account of the weakness of the Sultanate, he took to himself the title of Sultanus Sharq. Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 348; *Ferishta*, I, 154; *T.M.S.*, 156.

⁴⁸ Jaunpur's history may be traced from the time when Gaharwār Rajputs ruled at Manaich, which was the chief town in the district which was later to include the capital of the Sharq kings. In A.D. 1321 (721 H), during the reign of Ghayṣuddīn Tughlaq, his third son Zafar seized Manaich, which was changed to Zafarābād, and given to him as a jagir by the monarch. It was later on held by Sahibzādā Nāsir Khan, a natural son of Firōz Tughlaq. Firōz Tughlaq founded the city of Jaunpur on the Gomti during his return march from Bengal rebellion in A.D. 1359-60 (760 H) in memory of his cousin Jūnā Khan later known as Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq. In A.D. 1394 Malik Sarwar Khwājā Jahān was appointed its governor. *J.R.A.S.* 1905, 139-40; *J.A.S.B.*, XVIII, 1921, Numismatic Supplement, xxxvi 100-141; *District Gazetteer, Jaunpur*, 150.

⁴⁹ *T.M.S.*, 157; *T.A.*, I, 250-51; Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 348-49; *Ferishta*, I, 154.

being all seemed well, but with the passage of time Khwājā Jahān's power and influence increased, and in the end this proved detrimental to the interests of the Sultanate.

In the west Sārang Khan arrived at Deopulpur in June, 1394 (Sh'abān, 796 H).⁵¹ He began preparations to deal with Shaikha Khokhar who had occupied Lahore and had been left untouched by Prince Humayūn because of the demise of his royal father. At the end of the rainy season Sārang Khan started for Lahore with Rai Daljit Bhatti of Bhatnir, Rai Daūd of Jalandhar, Rai Kamāluddīn Maīn of Ludhiana and many other chiefs of the Punjab. He forded the Sutlej at the village of Tirhara,⁵² but his movements did not daunt his adversary. On the contrary, working on the principle that offence was the best form of defence, Shaikha plundered the suburbs of Deopulpur and laid siege to Ajodhan. Sārang Khan, undismayed, continued his march, and when Shaikha was convinced that Lahore would be invested, he hurried to its rescue. A well-contested engagement took place at Samuthala.⁵³ The Khokhar chief was routed and he fled towards the mountains of Jammu.⁵⁴ Sārang Khan placed Lahore under the command of his brother Khandu, entitled 'Adil Khan, and himself returned to Deopulpur.⁵⁵

During the course of these events Sultan Mahmūd visited Bayana and Gwalior, leaving Muqarrab Khan, the Vakīl-us-Sultānat, as the regent at Delhi. S'aādat Khan, the Barbak (Lord Chamberlain) was in the royal camp. When the King was at Gwalior some nobles headed by Mallū Khan, a brother of Sārang Khan, jealous of S'aādat Khan's influence — the young Sultan, conspired against him. Getting scent of the plot, S'aādat Khan got the conspirators put to death, but Mallū Khan escaped to Delhi and joined Muqarrab Khan. Muqarrab was an old enemy of S'aādat, and when the Sultan returned to Delhi, Muqarrab Khan fearing retri-

⁵¹ T.M.S., 157; T.A., I, 251.

⁵² T.M.S., 157. Tirhara is in Ludhiana district. It was a Mahāl in Sarkar Sarhind, Sūbā Punjab, and had a brick fort in Akbar's days. *Ann. Tra.*, II, 295; J.A.S.B., 1869, 88.

⁵³ T.M.S., 157; Badaoni, I, 264. Nizāmuddīn and Ferishta do not give the name of the place. It remains unidentified.

⁵⁴ T.M.S., 157; Badaoni, I, 264; T.A., I, 251; Ferishta, I, 154.

⁵⁵ T.M.S., 158.

sals closed the gates of the city against him.⁵⁶ S'aādat Khan, with the Sultan in his camp, laid siege to the fortress. The siege of Delhi went on for three months after which Muqarrab Khan, to outwit his rival, invited the Sultan into the city. Mahmūd had got weary of the siege and his humiliating position. He forsook S'aādat and entered Delhi in November, 1394 (Muharram, 797 H).⁵⁷ But the Sultan's action did not impair S'aādat's strength who had all the army still under his control. He even determined to teach a lesson to Sultan Mahmūd himself. Proceeding to Firōzābād, he invited from Mewat another prince of the royal blood, Nusrat Khan, son of Fateh Khan and grandson of Firōz Shāh,⁵⁸ and enthroned him under the title of Nasiruddīn Nusrat Shāh in December, A. D. 1394 (Rabiul-Avval 797 H). There were now two titular kings, Nasiruddīn (Mahmūd) at Delhi and Nasiruddīn (Nusrat) at Firōzābād. Badaoni's cryptic remark is very significant. He says that as in the game of chess neither could win be removed;⁵⁹ both remained mere puppets in the hands of their patron-nobles.

S'aādat's success soon made him arrogant and he became unpopular in his camp.⁶⁰ Afraid of an attack on his life, he fled to seek shelter in Delhi. There he was first beguiled and then treacherously done to death by Muqarrab Khan. But the mischief he had done did not end with his death; many influential Amīrs like Muhammad Muzaffar Tatār Khan, Shihāb Nāhar and Fazlullā Balkhī threw in their lots with Nāsiruddīn Nusrat. Nāsiruddīn controlled the districts between the Doab, Sambhal, Panipat and Rohtak, while Mahmūd possessed the old Delhi, Sīri and some adjoining districts.⁶¹ Sultan Mahmūd placed Bahadur Nāhar, who had remained loyal to him, in charge of the fortress at old Delhi, and gave to Mallū the title of Iqbāl Khan and the command of the fortress at Sīri. From now onwards regular skirmishes between Delhi and Firōzābād became an everyday affair. Sometimes Delhi was besieged, at others Firōzābād, and the Hindus and Musalmāns were killed in large numbers.⁶² "The Amīrs and Malīks

⁵⁶ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 350, says he was greatly scared.

⁵⁷ T.M.S., 158-59; Ferishta, I, 155. ⁵⁸ Badaoni, I, 265; Ferishta, I, 155.

⁵⁹ Badaoni, I, 266; Ranking, I, 351 n.

⁶⁰ Ferishta, I, 155; T.M.S., 160.

⁶¹ T.M.S., 160; Badaoni, I, 266.

⁶² T.M.S., 160; Ferishta, I, 155.

of the Empire set themselves up as rulers, and levied taxes and tribute and for the next three years the affairs of the country remained in this state."⁶³

Such are the euphemistic references of the chroniclers to the miserable condition of the people of Hindustan. In the time of Firōz Tughlaq, when peace prevailed, no "strong man could tyrannise over the weak".⁶⁴ But now it was all confusion. Kings were changing, or were being changed, almost every year if not every month. As if this ■■■ not bad enough, there were pairs of kings—Abū Bakr and Muḥammad, Nāsiruddīn Mahmūd and Nāsiruddīn Nusrat. The intrigues of the nobility made matters worse. S'ādat and Muqarrab fought regular battles using kings ■■■ pawns in their game of power politics. Indeed, according to Yahya, "each and every nobleman wanted to become the Sultan."⁶⁵ The Hindu chiefs and zamindars could hardly refrain from making the most of this. They gathered strength, withheld payment of taxes and tribute, and even plundered the villages of the Musalmāns.⁶⁶ Everywhere in Hindustan the rural and urban population suffered terribly.⁶⁷ For a decade after Firōz's death the princes manoeuvred, the nobles intrigued and the people suffered. Still worse was to happen.

Sārang Khan, the governor of Deopulpur, had at last dislodged Shaikha Khokhar from Lahore and had re-occupied it. His ambition did not rest there. He attacked Khizr Khan at Multan and occupied it (1396).⁶⁸ Khizr Khan fled and sought refuge with Shams Khan Auhadi at Bayana.⁶⁹ Next year Sārang attacked Samana, but its governor Ghālīb Khan with the help of Tātār Khan, Nusrat Shāh's Vazīr, inflicted ■■ crushing defeat on him on ■■ October, 1397 (15 Muharram, 800 H).⁷⁰

Sārang Khan had hardly recovered from the shock of defeat when, on his return to Multan, he learnt that Pir Muḥammad, grandson of Amīr Timūr of Khurāsān, having crossed the Indus

⁶³ T.M.S., 160-61. Also T.A., I, 253; Badaoni, I, 266; Ferishta, I, 135.

⁶⁴ T.M.S., 140. ⁶⁵ T.M.S., 140. ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 147. ⁶⁷ Ferishta, I, 135.

⁶⁸ T.M.S., 161. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 352.

⁶⁹ Z.N., II, 175 has Ahodan (أهودن), but the person referred to is Shams Khan Auhadi who ■■■ Amīr of Bayana from about 1397 to 1416 (800 to 819 H). Ferishta, I, 139.

⁷⁰ T.A., I, 254; T.M.S., 162.

had laid siege to Uchch. The governor of Uchch 'Alī Malik had held out for a month when Sārang Khan sent him a reinforcement of 4,000 horse under his deputy Malik Tājuddīn.⁷¹ To intercept this succour Pīr Muḥammad lifted the siege of Uchch, attacked and defeated Tājuddīn at Taratama⁷² on the banks of the Sutlej and marching in his pursuit went up to Multan. He besieged Multan and after six months occupied it on 5 June, 1398 (19 Ramzān 800 H).⁷³ Sārang Khan, along with his family, was taken prisoner.⁷⁴

The news of the arrival of Pīr Muḥammad and his occupation of Multan should have warned the rulers of Delhi and Firōzābād to sink their differences, but they continued to remain puppets in the hands of their intriguing nobles. The ambition of Mallū Iqbāl Khan, younger brother of Sārang Khan, knew no limits. He had owed his rise to Muqarrab Khan and Sultan Maḥmūd, but resenting the dominance of his benefactor Muqarrab he leagued himself with Sultan Nāsiruddīn Nusrat Shāh "on a most solemn oath" in June-July, 1398 (Shawwāl, 800 H),⁷⁵ and both of them attacked old Delhi. When Iqbāl Khan could not take Delhi, he treacherously attacked Nāsiruddīn himself and occupied Firōzābād. A little later he managed to kill Muqarrab Khan also and obtained complete control of Delhi.

After Iqbāl's treachery Nusrat Shāh left for Panipat to seek help from his Vazīr, Muḥammad Muzaffar Tātār Khan, and, the following month, marched towards Delhi. Iqbāl Khan leaving Delhi in the hands of his trusted men marched to Panipat and invested it. The capitulation of Panipat made Tātār Khan give up the siege of Delhi. He fled with his army to his father in Gujarat,⁷⁶ while Nusrat Shāh found asylum in the Doab.

Iqbāl returned victorious to Delhi, rich with spoils of war, horses and elephants. He was now all powerful. The boy-king Maḥmūd was his puppet. But his triumph was short-lived for news had flashed forth that Amīr Timūr had marched into Hindustan, had sacked Tulamba and was fast approaching Delhi.

⁷¹ T.M.S., 162 has 4,000. Badaoni, Ranking, I, has 1,000 only.

⁷² T.M.S., 162; Basu's trs., 169. In E and D, IV, 33 it is given as Tamtama. Also Badaoni, I, 267-68; Ranking, I, 353.

⁷³ Z.N., II, 14-15; R.S., VI, 100; T.M.S., 158-59.

⁷⁴ T.M.S., 163; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 354.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ T.M.S., 164; F.A., I, 254. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 354; *Mirāt-i-Sikandar*, 14.

Chapter 2

VISITATION OF A SCOURGE

AMIR TIMUR GURGAN,¹ who led a terrible campaign into Hindustan in A. D. 1398-99, and dealt a mortal blow at the Sultanate of Delhi, was born on Tuesday, 9 April, 1336 (25 Sh'abān, 736 H)² in the town of Sabzwār about 40 miles south of Samarkand. His father was Amīr Turghay, chief of the Gūrgān branch of the Barlās tribe, and his mother was Taghīnā Khātūn.³ To belong to the Barlās tribe was no little honour, yet his extraction has been traced back to the fabulous virgin Alankua, reputed to be the common ancestress of Chingiz and Timūr.⁴ Also, since he won many great victories, his birth was considered by historians to have taken place under the conjunction of auspicious planets, in consequence of which they have associated with him the title of Sāhib-i-Qirān or Master of the Conjunctions.⁵

Timūr received his education under the care of his great-grandfather Qarāchar Nūyān, Minister of Chaghtāi Khan. He was five and twenty when his father died, in 1361, and he had to flee the country the following year. It was during these wanderings that, while fighting a Sīstānī army in southern Afghanistan, in 1363, he received an arrow-wound in his foot, which maimed him for life and earned for him the sobriquet of Tamerlane.

For seven years Timūr faced privations after which he gradually recovered control of Transoxiana (1363-70). He ascended the

¹ Gūrgān is from *gurg* or wolf which was the insignia of the family. For a discussion on the title see *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, Elias and Ross, 278 n.; Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 353 n.; A.N., Beveridge, I, 204 n.; Harold Lamb, *Tamerlane the Earth Shaker*, 176 n.

² Erskine, *Bābur and Humayūn*, I, 69. Also Gibbon, II, 1233 n.

³ A.N., Bev., I, 205. Khātī Khan, *Bib. Ind.*, I, 14 has Nagīnā Khātūn.

⁴ Erskine, I, 69.

⁵ Qirān indicates, in the astrology of Persia, conjunction of two or more planets. Timūr was born in the Mouse year (first of the Turkish cycle) under the sign of Capricorn. He was the first to take the title of Sāhib Qirān, but the name is not found on his coins. J.A.S.B., VI (new series) 1910, 574-75. A.N., Bev., I, 205. Gibbon, (II, 1233 n.) however, doubts if he was born under this conjunction. Also Sykes, *History of Persia*, II, 199.

throne on Wednesday, 9 April, 1370 (12 Ramzān, 771 H) which coincided with his thirty-fourth birthday.⁵ Henceforward during the forty years of continual warfare, he never suffered defeat and subjugated countries from the "Dardanelles to Delhi".⁷

After the subjugation of the whole Central Asian region up to Moscow (which, however, escaped his visitation), it was natural for Tīmūr to dream of world conquest. Accordingly, in 1397 he gave to his grandson Pīr Muhammad, son of Jahāngīr,⁸ then a mere lad of fifteen, the provinces of Qundūz, Baghlān, Kabul, Ghaznī and Qandhār "with all the dependencies as far as the confines of Hind",⁹ and he encouraged to march farther eastward into India. Crossing the Indus, Pīr Muhammad assaulted and took by storm the city of Uchch. He garrisoned the fort of Uchch and proceeded to Multan where, however, he received a check, for he wrote to his grandfather: "As Sārang had carefully fortified and strengthened this fortress, I am at this moment engaged in the siege, giving one assault twice every day. . . . I am now waiting for further instructions."¹⁰ The crisis decided the issue. Tīmūr realised that he needs must march to Hindustan and afford relief to his grandson.

Such was the immediate and the real cause of the invasion of India. But Tīmūr's historians have made a virtue of necessity, and have made out that the decision was inspired by a desire of destroying infidels and idolaters¹¹ besides the prospect of obtaining wealth in abundance. Indeed the conquest of India had fired the imagination of all great conquerors ever since the time of Alexander of Macedon, and Tīmūr wanted to vie with his illustrious predecessors and repeat their achievements. What provided the impetus to Tīmūr's ambition was the report of his secret agents that while two brothers Sārang Khan and Mallū Khan were wielding authority at Multan and Delhi respectively, the young Sultan Mahmūd was despised "even in the harem of Delhi".¹²

⁵ A.N., Bev., I, 208.

⁷ Erskine, I, 72.

⁸ Pīr Muhammad (d. 809 H, A.D. 1406) was the son of Ghayāsuddīn Jahāngīr, the son of Tīmūr. Lane-Poole, *The Muhammadan Dynasties*, Table facing p. 268.

⁹ Z.N., II, 14, R.S., VI, 100.

¹⁰ M.T., E and D, III, 399.

¹¹ Z.N., II, 15. Also M.T., ■ and D, III, 429.

¹² Z.N., II, 14-15; R.S. VI, 100.

March into Hindūstan

Timūr left Samargand in March, 1398 (Rajjab, 800 H)¹⁸ and set off for India with an army of 92,000 strong¹⁹ chiefly drawn from the Turkish tribes beyond the Oxus.²⁰ After a halt at Tirmiz he crossed the Jihūn (Oxus) and then encamped at Khulm.²¹ Then passing through Ghazniyāk²² and Samangān, he arrived at Indarāb, *en route* to the passes of the Hindu Kush. From Indarāb he marched at the head of a contingent of 30,000 to punish the Siyāh Pōshes, probably the descendants of Indo-Bactrians.²³ Having dealt with them in his own way he resumed his advance, arrived at Naghz via Kabul from where he dispatched Amīr Sulaimān to join Pīr Muhammad at Multan,²⁴ and himself proceeded to Bannū.

He reached the banks of the Indus on 20 September, 1398 (8 Muharram, 801 H).²⁵ It was crossed at Dhankōt, near Kalābāgh, on a bridge of boats, and the Amīr encamped at the very spot where Jalāluddīn Khwarizm Shāh, had fled before Chingīz Khan. Here the Amīr received envoys from various rulers who had been seized with alarm, professing their submission. Of these one was from the king of Kashmir, Sikandar Shāh, conveying his feelings of loyalty and obedience. In reply the Shāh was directed to join the invader with his army at Deopalpur.²⁶

¹⁸ Z.N., II, 17.

¹⁹ Sykes, II, 207; Gibbon, II, 1238. Price, III, 220 citing the *Institutes* of Timūr gives the figure as 62,000. Yazdī has "more numerous than the leaves of the forest or the drops in rain"; Z.N., II, 18. Mirkhwānd has "100,000 under his own command". R.S., VI, 103.

²⁰ Erskine, I, 72.

²¹ Khulm lay about 50 miles east of Balkh and about 5 miles north of modern Tashqurgān. Constable, ■ Bb; Holdich, *Gates of India*, 270.

²² Z.N., II, 19. M.T., E and D, III, 400 wrongly has Ghaztik. It is shown as Ghazniyāk in the India Survey map of Afghanistan. ■ lies about 20 miles south of Tashqurgān and forty miles north of Samangān. Samangān is not shown on modern maps. It is the old name of Haibak and lies 40 miles S. W. ■ Baghlān, and about 110 miles N.W. of Indarāb. Holdich, *op. cit.*, 272. Haibak is shown in Constable ■ Cb.

²³ J.A.S.B., II, 1833. 305-7. J.A.S.B., III, 1834, 76-79.

²⁴ Price, III (I), 234.

²⁵ Z.N., II, 64.

²⁶ Deopalpur in the Montgomery district is situated on the north bank of the Sultej between Firōzpur and Jalandhar, 30° 40' N 73° 32' E. A place of historical importance, it is identified by Cunningham with Daidala of Ptolemy.

From the camp to Delhi the shortest distance measured no more than six hundred miles; but Timūr turned towards southeast, firstly, because his original plan was to relieve his grandson who was in distress, and secondly, because his army was small and he did not want to embroil himself in unnecessary conflicts. Accordingly, even though there was a better route to Multan he chose the shorter route. He met with ~~no~~ opposition on the way; on the other hand, many Rajas and Zamindars purchased their peace by sending presents to him.²¹

After a long and arduous march Amīr Timūr arrived ~~at~~ the bank of the Jhelum. Here he was informed of the treachery of Shihābuddīn Mubārak Shāh Tamīmī who had first surrendered to Pīr Muhammad but had subsequently changed his mind. He not only refrained from coming to pay his homage to the great conqueror, but he shut himself in the citadel which was protected by an almost impregnable moat.²² Timūr laid siege of the fort and compelled Shihābuddīn to fly to Uchch.

Through the Punjab

Having ~~gone~~ ~~down~~ the citadel of Shihābuddīn, Timūr resumed his march along the banks of the Jhelum. On Thursday, 3 October, 1398 (21 Muharram, 801 H), he arrived at Shorkot on the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenab²³ which he crossed on 9 October.²⁴ He encamped ~~on~~ the other bank facing the town of Tulamba, 52 miles north-east of Multan.²⁵ He demanded from the inhabitants

²¹ Z.N., II, 47-8; M.T., E and D, III, 409-10.

²² In the M.T. Shihābuddīn's kingdom is said to be a "*fakra* in the middle of the river". But in Z.N. it is clearly mentioned as being by the side of the river Jamd.

²³ The name of the place where the junction took place is not given either in ~~the~~ M.T. or the Z.N. But Nizām-i-Shamī calls it سُر Sūr (130 b), by which he must ~~mean~~ Shor or Shorkot. Shor or Shorkot lies twenty six miles north of Tulamba on the road from the latter to Jhang. I.G. XVI, 161.

²⁴ Z.N., II, 53.

²⁵ Tulamba is said ~~to~~ have been 35 *kuroh* from Multan in Z.N., II, 54. T.M.S., 218 has 40 *kuroh*, and so also has Ferishta. But *kuroh* was about 1½ miles and not 2. The mīl of Ibn Battūta described "Synonymous with *kuroh*" (Trs. Mahdi Hussain, Introduction, 1) was equal to 1.44 of the present mile. A *farsakh* ~~is~~ *farsang* was equal to 6,000 yards. Tulamba is actually

■ ransom of two lacs; the 'Ulema and the Shaikhs were to be exempted from its payment. Soon quite ■ large proportion of the demand had been paid. While the balance was being realised, the soldiers poured into the town and sacked it, sparing only the Shaikhs and Saiyyads.²⁷ The unscrupulous conduct of the invader opened the eyes of others who had already submitted to Pir Muhammad. They now changed their mind and became hostile towards him.

Timūr next moved to Shāhpur situated opposite the town of Shāhnawāz.²⁸ From there he led a sortie on Jasrat Khokhar, son of Shaikha Khokhar of Lahore.²⁹ Jasrat was worsted, many of his ■ were slain, but he himself managed to join ³⁰ his father. The Khokhar chief, because of his enmity towards Sārang Khan, readily submitted to the conqueror and, according to Hāji Dabīr, even helped Timūr in his attack on Delhi.³¹

Timūr left Shāhnawāz on Thursday, 25 October (13 Safar) and marching along the bank of the Ravi encamped outside the village of Janjān, where the river was fordable.³² Here he received ■ detailed account of the difficulties which beset his grandson after he had occupied Multan.³³ Heavy rains followed by an epidemic had killed a large number of horses forcing him to the necessity of using bullock-carts for transport purposes.³⁴ Added to this

52 miles N.N.E. of Multan and is shown in Rennel's map (facing p. 65). During the time of Akbar ■ ■ Pargana ■ ■ in the Sarkar of Bari Doab, the province of Multan. *Āin Jarret's trs.*, II, 329-30. Also Hunter, *Imp. Gaz.*, XIII, 163.

²⁷ Z.N., II, 55; M.T., E and D, III, 414.

²⁸ Z.N., II, 56; M.T., E and D, III, 415-16. Shāhnawāz seems to have disappeared because of the changes in the ■ of rivers. It is, however, given in Rennel's map facing p. 65 on the eastern bank of the Chenab. It also finds mention in the itinerary of one Saiyyad Ajal, 1786. According to him the stages were Multan to Shāhnawāz ■ kos, Shāhnawāz to Shāhpur 10 kos and then ■ kos more to Tulamba. Raverty, *Mihran*, 282 ■ Also Hodi-
vala, 351.

²⁹ R.S., VI, 104.

³⁰ Sharafuddin wrongly writes that Jasrat ■ killed (Z. N. II, 57). Jasrat remained a prominent figure in the politics of the Sultanate during the rule of the Saiyyads.

³¹ Z.W., III, 905.

³² Z.N., II, 59.

³³ Vide Chapter I.

³⁴ Z.N., II, 59-60. ■ T., E and D, III, 417. The rains must have been very severe. Although Sindh experiences very slight rainfall and the average annual rainfall in Multan is ■ inches, yet there are freaks of nature. In

was the harassment caused by local zamindars who exploited the situation to their advantage. Pīr Muhammad found himself at his wits' end, but the report of his grandfather's arrival infused fresh courage into his heart.

On 26 October (14 Safar) Pīr Muhammad had audience with his grandfather,³⁵ who lavishly rewarded the prince and his nobles. Fresh mounts were supplied to all of his soldiers who once more became ready for fresh adventures.³⁶ Tīmūr was always liberal in giving rewards and providing free accoutrements to his troops. He writes that he could maintain his power for so long because he "divided among his soldiers the treasures which he had gathered".³⁷ At another place he says: "I advanced to my troops their wages even before they were due".³⁸

Tīmūr halted at Janjān for four days and then marching via Schwāl and Aswān he arrived at Jahwāl where he encamped.³⁹ There he began preparations for punishing the people of Deopapur, who had not only retracted their promise of loyalty to Pīr Muhammad, but had killed the Timuride governor Musāfir Kabuli and his one thousand men.⁴⁰ The news of the approach of Tīmūr now greatly scared the people of Deopapur. After the fall of Sārang Khan, they had no leader to guide ■ protect them. Abandoning the city they took refuge in the fortress of Bhatnūr, then considered to be one of the strongest forts of India. Tīmūr appointed Amīr Shāh Malik and Daulat Tīmūr Tawāchī to lead the main force to Delhi via Deopapur and Samana while he himself marched via Ajodhan (modern Pāk Patan)⁴¹ with a body of 10,000 picked

1902 it reached ■ inches. Multan was also visited by severe floods as in 1893-4 and 1905. I.G. XVIII, 24. Also I.G. XXII, 394.

³⁵ Z.N., II, 60.

³⁶ Z.N., II, 62.

³⁷ Davy, *Institutes of Timur*, 65.

³⁸ Davy, *op. cit.*, 217.

³⁹ Z.N., II, 58, 62; M.T., ■ and D, III, 420; Price, III (I), 241; R.S., VI, 105. From Multan Janjān is said to have been situated at ■ distance of 40 *kuroh* (Z.N., II, 61). Janjān, Schwāl and Aswān have disappeared on account of the changes in the courses of the rivers. However, they have all been located by Rennel on his *Memoir of a Map of Hindustan*, facing p. 65.

⁴⁰ Z.N., II, 62; R.S., VI, 105-6.

⁴¹ Ajodhan also known as Pāk Patan lies at about 80 miles S.W. of Shāh-nawāz. The distance from Ajodhan to Bhatnūr is about 90 miles. For a copious and informative note on Ajodhan see Badaoni, Ranking, I, 362-63.

cavalry.⁴³ At Ajodhan though most of the Saiyyads and 'Ulema, encouraged by the preferential treatment meted out to their section at Tulamba, waited upon Tīmūr, there were patriots like Shaikh Sa'āduddīn and Shaikh Munawwar⁴⁴ who exhorted the people not to submit to the blackmailer but to accompany them to Bhatnir on their way to Delhi. After paying a visit to the mausoleum of the celebrated saint Shaikh Farīd Shakargunj⁴⁵ and appointing Khwājā Muhammad and other officers to protect the 'Ulema and the Saiyyads whose conduct must have annoyed the people of the city, Tīmūr left Ajodhan early in November, 1398.⁴⁶ Crossing the river Gharra he halted at Khālis Khatoli,⁴⁷ now known as Pīr Khālis, fifty kos from Bhatnir. Next morning, at about breakfast time, he arrived at Bhatnir having marched fifty kos in less than twenty-four hours⁴⁷ which was deemed to be ■ extraordinary feat in those days.

Bhatnir (or Hanūmāngarh) was a Rajput stronghold, and people considered it impregnable⁴⁸ as it was surrounded by ■ desert for about 50 kos around in which no water could be obtained. The citadel itself was supplied with water throughout the year by ■ reservoir which was replenished during the rainy season. A large number of refugees from Deopulpur and Ajodhan had come there

⁴³ Z.N., II, 64; R.S., VI, 106.

⁴⁴ Z.N., II, 65. M.T., E. and D. III, 421. Sharafuddin and Nizām-i Shams (136) say that Shaikh Munawwar ■ a grandson of ■ Shaikh Nūriddīn. Hodivala, 359, says, "I venture to identify the latter with Shaikh Nūriddīn of Hānsi who ■ preceptor of Shams Sirāj 'Aṣif". T.F.S. (A), 81. Shaikh Sa'āduddīn was a descendant of Shaikh Farīduddīn Shakargunj.

⁴⁵ For the saint and his tomb ■ J.A.S.B., V, 634-38. He ■ ■ pīr of the celebrated saint Nizāmuddīn Auliya.

⁴⁶ Z.N., II, 67, has Tuesday, 25 Safar (5 November). So ■ Price, III (1), 243.

⁴⁷ Z.N., II, 67, does not give the name of the river and only says: از آب آجودھن کہ مصلحت انہار مند است گذشتہ در خالص فرود آمد (He crossed the river of Ajodhan, which is one of the biggest streams of India, and came to Khālis (Kotli), but the river was surely the Gharra ■ Ghara which ■ between Ajodhan and Kotli. E and D, III, 488 note; Also Raverty, Mīhrān, 394 n. Ferishta, I, 156, calls it Khālis Koh.

⁴⁸ Z.N., II, 67-68. ■ M.T., E. and D. III, 422; Z.N., II, 66-67; also R.S., VI, 106 در میان غول و پیاہان واقع شد (text wrongly has چول) (was situated in the wilderness).

to seek asylum. The chief of the fort, Rao Daljit,⁴⁰ had made adequate preparations to meet the invader, but Timūr sought to strike terror among the garrison by massacring all those who had not been able to gain entrance into the fort because it was overfull. Then he delivered the assault from all sides. Having carried the outer wall, he rushed towards the citadel. A hand-to-hand fight ensued. "Jahān Malik fought like a lion, and Saiyyad Khwājā cut down several of the enemy."⁴¹ When Daljit had lost all hopes of saving the fort, he sent Shaikh Sa'āduddīn of Ajodhan to Timūr to intercede on his behalf. Timūr agreed to the proposal of peace and withdrew his men from the fort. On the morning of Friday, 8 November (28. Safar) Rao Daljit with the Shaikh waited upon Timūr⁴² with presents consisting of 27 Arab horses with gold mounted harness and several sporting hawks. Timūr received the Rao with kind consideration.

But the trouble did not end there. To take revenge for the murder of Musāfir Kabulī and his men, Timūr ordered the arrest of all the refugees from Deopulpur and Ajodhan. About 500 of them were massacred in cold blood and their women and children were enslaved.⁴³ This act of cruelty so much incensed Rao Daljit's cousin Kamāluddīn Maīn,⁴⁴ that he closed the gates of the city

⁴⁰ His name is given as Duljīn (دولجین) in Z. N., II, 68. *Mulfiuzāt* has Dulchīn (دولچین). Badaoni calls him (دولجین) Jaljīn. Ferishta has Rao Khaḥī (راہر خلیجی). In his translation of the *Mulfiuzāt*, Dowson adds a note (E. and D. III, 422) that Chāin = Chan is most probably intended for Chand. Chand is rather a Vaishya name and would not fit with the Kshatriya Rao. Briggs was obviously not satisfied with the reading of Sharafuddīn but does not risk a suggestion (Briggs I, 488 n). I suggest that it is Daljīt, for whom an error of the copyist was perhaps changed into ۛ. Chand from ۛ is rather far fetched; ۛ would be more appropriate. T.A. calls him Bhatti Rajput. Also T.A., De's Trs., I, 279.

⁴¹ M.T., III and D. III, 423.

⁴² Z.N., II, 71.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁴⁴ All MSS. mention Kamāluddīn as being the brother of Rao Daljit. Dowson expressed surprise at this because one brother had a Muslim name while the other had a Hindu name (E and D. III, 425 n. and 499). There were large scale conversions throughout the medieval period. Kamāluddīn Maīn may be one of the converts and a distant cousin, if not a real brother, of Daljit.

T.M.S. gives the name as Kamāluddīn Maīn ۛ. Maīn is a branch or sect of the Bhattis. "The term Bhatti is commonly applied to any Musal-

for a last trial of strength. Tīmūr at once put Rao Daljit to death,⁵⁴ levied a blackmail (which he euphemistically called ransom) on the town, and deputed Amīrs Nūruddīn and Allāhadād to collect the ransom.⁵⁵ The step occasioned general resentment and Hindus and Musalmāns all rose in a body to oppose the enemy. The Muslims, after the fashion of the Rajputs, consigned their women and children to the fire, and dashed out to fight. But their valour proved unavailing. They were killed to a man and their fortress was razed to the ground.

On Wednesday, 12 November (3 Rabiul Awwal),⁵⁶ Tīmūr left Bhatnār for Firōzābād, now known as Firōzābād Harni Khēra.⁵⁷ From there, on his eastward march he sacked Sirsuti⁵⁸ (situated on the river of the same name), Fatehābād⁵⁹ and Ahroni,⁶⁰ in the last of which "not a house was left standing".⁶¹

From Ahroni, Tīmūr arrived at Tohana.⁶² The people of the place were Muslim Jāts, but casting "aside all restraints of religion"⁶³ Tīmūr decided to attack them. In fact from Bhatnār to Delhi the Jāts were his main target of attack. They were killed in thousands; their places were occupied and governors appointed.⁶⁴ Resuming his march Tīmūr shortly after arrived on the banks of

man, Jat = Rajput, from the direction of the Sutlej, as a generic term". (Crooke, *Tribes and Castes*, 14; cited in Hodivala, 360).

Yahya calls Daljit and his son Hansū (Hansrāj) Bhattis while Rai Kamāl-uddin Maīn and his son Dāūd are invariably styled Maīns. T.M.S., 157 and ff; E and D, IV, 22, 28, 29, 32, 40. Barani also mentions Bhattis and Maīns.

⁵⁴ Badaoni, I, 269; Ranking, I, 355.

⁵⁵ Z.N., II, 74. ⁵⁶ Z.N., II, 77.

⁵⁷ Firōzābād got its name probably because of the fort constructed there by Firōz Tughlaq, T.F.S. (B), 566, and is called Firōzābād Harni Khēra by Shams Sirāj 'Aḥī, T.F.S. (A) 354, and Yahya, T.M.S., 126; E and D, IV, 8 n. The village of Firōzābād Harni Khēra still exists and lies about 12 miles west of Sirsā.

⁵⁸ Z.N., II, 77. ⁵⁹ Price, III, 247-48.

⁶⁰ Ahroni was a Mahāl in Sarkar Hissār Firōzī, Subā Delhi (Āin. Trs., 293). It is now called Ahirwān as its nomenclature is said to be from Ahir tribe. Elliot, *Races*, II, 133.

⁶¹ Z.N., II, 79.

⁶² Tohana, now a railway station, is situated 20 miles east of Ratia. Ratia is shown in constable 25 A.C. and it lies about 15 miles N.E. of Fatehābād.

⁶³ Z.N., II, 79. ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 81.

the Khagar,⁶⁵ where Amīr Sulaiman, who had marched via Mung,⁶⁶ joined him. A week later Tīmūr was joined by the main army coming up from Deopulpur under Amīr Shāh Malik. Since now all his force amounting to 92,000 strong was with him, Tīmūr thought it fit to reorganise it in the final stage of the march to Delhi.

To Delhi

On Wednesday, ■ December, 1398 (24 Rabiul Avval) the army arrived at Tughlaqpur,⁶⁷ twelve kos from Panipat. The city was deserted, but inside the fort ■ thousand maunds of wheat were found. Tīmūr could have directly moved on to Delhi, but he did not want to take any risks. He, therefore, crossed the Jumna on 8 December, at a point facing the village of Palla,⁶⁸ and then captured and burnt the fort of Lōnī.⁶⁹ He halted at Lōnī and occupied all the fords of the Jumna, one after another.⁷⁰ Simultaneously most parts of the Jumna-Ganga Doab opposite Delhi were harried. "The inhabitants of the towns and the villages, Muslims and Hindus alike, got panicky and ran away, some to the mountains, ■■■ to the jungles, while some others sought shelter in the fort of Delhi."⁷¹

On 10 December (1 Rabiul Ākhir), according to his usual practice,⁷² Amīr Tīmūr held a council of war in which everybody was allowed to have his say. Two apprehensions were universally expressed. One was the fear of the war-elephants of Hindustan the stories of whose terrific charges were widely current; and the other related to the scarcity of provisions. Moreover, the number of the

⁶⁵ The Khagar river is about half way between Bhatnār and Saraswati. See also Price, III, 247 n.

⁶⁶ Z.N., II, 82. Mung or Munk is shown in Rennel's map. According to Thornton it is ■ river Ghagghar on the road from Delhi to Firōzābād, 140 miles N.W. of the former. It lies N.E. of Fatehābād. Raverty, *Mihirān*, 439 and n.

⁶⁷ Price, III, 251 n. says, "This was probably ■■■ same with what is now called in the maps as Safedon, about the distance of 20 miles to the westward of Panipat".

⁶⁸ Z.N., II, 86.

⁶⁹ Lōnī was 7 miles N.N.W. of Delhi. Tieff., I, 136. Tīmūr arrived there ■ 27 Rabiul Avval. T.A., De, 279, n. 7.

⁷⁰ Ferishta, I, 157.

⁷¹ T.M.S., 165; Basu's trs., 172.

⁷² Davy, *Institutes of Timur*, 9-11.

prisoners of war had swelled to more than fifty thousand. They needs must be fed and fed probably for a long time in case Delhi stood a siege.⁷² To guard against the first danger Tīmūr had strong iron claws made which were given to the foot soldiers who were to hurl them before the attacking elephants.⁷³ To overcome the second difficulty Amīr Jahān Shāh and Amīr Sulaimān Shāh were directed to detail forage parties to collect large quantities of grain.⁷⁴

Next day the Amīr set out with about 700 horsemen to decide the site of the battle. On the other hand Mallū Khan, who was constantly watching the movements of the enemy, considered it a good opportunity to strike particularly when the latter had only a scanty following. Marching under the cover of trees and orchards,⁷⁵ he delivered a surprise attack with a force twenty times the number of the enemy. Tīmūr was hardly prepared for an engagement, and made a precipitate retreat, leaving Saiyyad Khwājā with 300 Turks to hold the ground. They were soon reinforced by two regiments (Kushūns) under Sanjak Bahadur and Amīr Allahādād who hurled back Mallū.

During the skirmish the prisoners in the camp of Tīmūr had become jubilant; and it was feared that on the day of the final battle with Sultan Mahmūd, when the army would be completely engrossed in war, the prisoners would break their bonds and make common cause with the Indian army. He, therefore, took a cruel and quick decision to do away with them. It took little time to kill the unarmed captives and about 50,000 men were massacred in cold blood on 12 December, 1398 (3 Rabi'ul Ākhir).⁷⁶ A pious man like Maulana Nasīruddīn 'Umar, "who in all his life had never killed a sparrow", for fear of Tīmūr slew with his own hand fifteen men who were his captives.⁷⁷

The massacre over, Tīmūr issued final instructions to his officers about his plan of action and their respective duties. He did not want "the war to be of long continuance".⁷⁸ The experience of Pir Muhammad at Multan, the failure of the strategy of the Mongols against 'Alāuddīn Khaljī and the debacle of Tarmashirīn must

⁷² Z.N., II, 102.

⁷³ Price, III, 252.

⁷⁴ Z.N., II, 87-88.

⁷⁵ R.S., VI, 108.

⁷⁶ For the number of the massacred see Appendix A.

⁷⁷ Z.N., II, 92.

⁷⁸ M.T., E and D, III, 437.

have convinced him of the futility of wasting time in sieges in India. He had not besieged Tulamba, and he did not want to lay siege to Delhi. So he manoeuvred for an open fight. He crossed the Jumna on Sunday, 14 December (5 Rabiul Ākhir)⁸⁰ with his whole army and encamped on the plains of Fīrōzābād⁸¹ near the hill of the Pusht-i-Bihālī, site of the present Wellington aerodrome.⁸² The encampment was protected with trenches, felled trees, palisades, and all kinds of fascines and gabions. In front of the ditch were fastened buffaloes and camels with their feet and neck tied together⁸³ and inside the fence they raised pent-houses (khamhā).⁸⁴ This disposition besides being effective in breaking any charge of elephants, was also intended to lure the enemy into the open by producing on him the impression of uncertainty and fear.⁸⁵

Sultan Mahmūd also made ready for the battle, although his preparations were much too inadequate for defeating a general like Timūr with his host of ninety thousand warriors. The entire Delhi army consisted of 10,000 cavalry, 40,000 infantry and 125 elephants.⁸⁶ He could not bank upon the support of neighbouring rulers. Khwājā Jahān of Jaunpur was busy in extending his territories in the east, and cared little to come to Delhi's rescue. Gujarat was far too distant, though it pretended loyalty.⁸⁷ Mewat was restive, and the contumacious Punjab lay low at the feet of the conqueror. Mahmūd had for some years under him only the old Delhi, the fortress of Sīrī and the Jahānpanāh. Though Mallū Khan

⁸⁰ Z.N., II, 96; M.T., E and D, III, 437 and R.S., VI, 109 have the above date. Ferishta (II, 158) mistakenly puts it a month later as Jamadiul Avval and continues the mistake by making all subsequent events happen a month later than they actually did.

⁸¹ Ferishta, I, 158.

⁸² Timūr's camp was on what is now known as the Ridge, and the battle took place on the plain traversed by the high road from Safdar Jang's tomb to the Qutb Minār. (Fanshawe, *Delhi, Past and Present*, 58). Ghayāsuddīn Tughlaq routed Nāsīruddīn Khusrū on the same spot. Also Hodivala, 361.

⁸³ According to Ferishta, I, 158, the buffaloes were stationed inside the ditch. So also has Turuk.

⁸⁴ Z.N., II, 96.

⁸⁵ *Turuk*, text, 74; Z.N., II, 98-99.

⁸⁶ Z.N., II, 83; A.N., I, 244. Z.W., III, 906, has 120 elephants and twenty or forty thousand cavalry.

⁸⁷ Epi. Indo-Moslemica, 1939-40, 2.

was loyal to the Sultan; he had hardly any friends ■ supporters outside Delhi,⁸⁰ and the prospects of victory were few. Thus "the harvest was fully ripe for the bloody reaper Timūr".⁸²

During the night preceding 7 Rabi'ul Ākhir, Timūr's men were constantly on the alert to prevent any surprise attack by the enemy. On the morning of the 7th⁸⁰ (16 December, 1398) the rival forces moved forward for the final encounter, each side arrayed in the traditional order of Centre, Right and Left. Timūr's right wing was led by Prince Fīr Muhammad, Amīr Yādgar Barlās, Amīr Sulaimān Shāh and other officers. The left wing was under Princes Sultan Husain, Khalīl Sultan, Amīr Jahān Shāh and Shaikh Arsalān. Timūr himself commanded the centre, while the vanguard was placed under Prince Rustam, Amīr Shaikh Nūruddīn, Amīr Shāh Malik, Amīr Allahadād and others.⁸¹

Mahmūd's left wing was commanded by Taghī Khan, Mīr 'Alī of Uchch⁸³ and other officers; while the right wing ■ under Mu'īnuddīn and Malik Hādī.⁸⁴ The Sultan himself with Mallū Khan was in the centre.⁸⁴ "The elephants were covered with armour," writes Sharafuddīn, "and sharp poisoned points were fastened firmly on their tusks. Rocket men (*lakhsh-afgan*) and grenade throwers (*r'ād andās*) marched by their sides."⁸⁵ Sultan Mahmūd traditionally relied too much on elephants, the animate tanks of medieval India. "They were trained in war ■ famous for their power as rank-breakers (*saf-shikan*) and cavalry dispensers."⁸⁶

⁸⁰ Z.W., III, 905.

⁸¹ E.I. New Imperial Series, II, 1894, 297.

⁸² It may be remembered that the day in Islam begins with sunset.

⁸³ Z.N., II, 98-99.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 100, has میر علی. Mīr 'Alī Haujā must be 'Alī Malik of Uchch, who was in command of the fortress when Fīr Muhammad besieged it. هوچه is a perverted transcription of Uchch (اوچه).

⁸⁵ E and D, III, 498 has Malik Hādī. Mu'īnuddīn and Malik Hādī cannot be identified, but Taghī Khan ■ Tughān Khan (as Nizām-i-Shamī calls him at fol. 140 a) may be Taghī Khan Turkbachcha-i-Sultānī of the T.M.S., 170. Hodivala, 353-56. Also Z.W., III, 906.

⁸⁶ This is the organisation given in Z.N., II, 100 and M.T., E and D, III, 439. Dowson in all probability through oversight transposes the command of the right and left wings in his trans. of the *Zafarnāmā*, E and D, III, 498.

⁸⁷ Z.N., II, 100; Tra. in ■ and D, III, 498.

⁸⁸ Jadunath Sarkar, "Military History of India," *The Hindustan Standard*, March 21, 1954.

But the Hindustani infantry was poor in stuff having been drawn from amongst the Gūjar and Jāt peasants and Meo robbers. "Their favourite weapon was the bamboo staff, though many of them carried a rusty sword also,"⁹⁷ while the archers amongst them were ineffective.

Battle of Delhi

The battle began with the beating of drums and raising of shouts and cries from both sides. In the very first charge Timūr's army struck at the various wings of the enemy engaging it at every point, thus rendering it impotent for concentrated action and dispersing it into separate units to be dealt with in detail. Sanjak Bahādur, Saiyyad Khwājā, Amīr Allahadād and others of the vanguard first moved off to the right, and then wheeling suddenly behind the enemy's advance-guard scattered five to six hundred of them in a single onslaught.⁹⁸ Meanwhile Pīr Muhammad Jahangīr of the right wing assisted by Amīr Sulaimān Shāh fell upon the left wing of the enemy under Taghī Khan and mauled it so severely as to throw it back as far as the Hauz-i-Khās.⁹⁹ Similarly prince Sultan Husain of the left wing attacked and scattered the Indian army's right wing under Malik Mu'īnuddīn, pursuing its remnants to the very gates of Delhi. But the centre of the Delhi army held its ground. Nay, supported by the armoured elephants it made a fierce charge on Prince Rustam's men, but they managed to parry it with courage and determination. This gave time to Shaikh Nūriddīn, Amīr Shāh Malik, Timūr Tawāchī and Manglī Khwājā to bring their men into action and cut their way across to the elephants. The frontal attack of Sultan Mahmūd thus received a check while his two wings had been badly broken. But the battle raged fiercely until the evening, when Mahmūd's soldiers, despondent and exhausted, began to flee. The flight soon turned into a stampede and in the enveloping darkness many were trampled underfoot and heaps of dead were left behind. As night descended Sultan Mahmūd with Mallū Khan escaped into the citadel of Delhi "with a thousand difficulties" and closed its gates. Timūr pursued

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ Z.N., II, 105.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 106.

Mahmūd up to the city gates but because of darkness he returned to the Hauz-i-Khās.¹⁰⁰

The army of Hindustan had failed, but it had fought bravely against a force at least twice as large in numbers. Timūr does not fail to give it due praise, and the praise from the enemy is the greatest compliment. "The soldiers of Sultan Mahmūd and Mallū Khan," says he, "showed a lack of courage. On the contrary they bore themselves manfully in the fight, but they could not withstand the successive assaults of my soldiers."¹⁰¹

Inside the fort Sultan Mahmūd and Mallū Khan made a hurried review of the situation. Surrender would have meant complete annihilation, with no hope of recovery. Timūr's movements had clearly indicated that his was a lightning campaign and he had no intention of staying in India. Consequently the Sultan and his Vazīr decided on flight. Avoiding the Hauz-i-Khās near which Timūr had encamped, they left by two different gates, Mahmūd by the Hauz-i-Rānī Gate and Mallū Khan by the Hauz-i-Shamsī Gate.¹⁰² Timūr, who was keeping a constant watch, had got scent of their flight and sent Amīr S'āid and Khwājā Aqbugha in their pursuit. They captured many men including Saifuddīn and Khudādād,¹⁰³ the two sons of Mallū Khan, but Sultan Mahmūd and Mallū Khan escaped, the former towards Gujarat and the latter towards Baran (Buland Shahr).¹⁰⁴

Next morning, Wednesday, 17 December, 1398 (8 Rabi'us Sāni 807 H.)¹⁰⁵ Timūr held his court in the Idgāh situated between the

¹⁰⁰ Z.N., II, 106. M.T., E and D, III, 441. Timūr was mistaken in his belief that Hauz-i-Khās "was built by Sultan Firōz Shāh". Sharafuddīn persists in the mistake. Z.N., II, 109.

The reservoir of Hauz-i-Khās, also known as Hauz-i-'Alāī, was built by Sultan 'Alāuddīn Khālījī (1296-1316) in the very first year of his accession. This magnificent tank covered an area of over 70 acres, and was surrounded by a stone and masonry wall. Firōz Tughlaq only got it cleaned in about 1354 as it had got filled with mud and silt by that time obviously through neglect. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 338-9 also 347. Thomas, *Chronicles*, 310 n. Carr Stephen, 183. Saiyyad Ahmad Khan, *Asār*, BK III, 27. K. S. Lal, *History of the Khālījīs*, 375.

¹⁰¹ M.T., E and D, III, 441.

¹⁰² Hodiwala, II, 144.

¹⁰³ Z.N., II, 116; Ferishta, I, 158; R.S., VI, 111.

¹⁰⁴ Ferishta, I, 158. T.A., I, 255. Badaoni, Ranking I, 357.

¹⁰⁵ E and D, III, 502; Price, III, 262.

Jahānpanāh and the Hauz-i-Khās.¹⁰⁶ Fazlulla Balkhī,¹⁰⁷ the veteran financier, nobles, Shaikhs and the elite of Delhi came to pay homage. At the request of Fazlulla, amnesty was granted to the city.¹⁰⁸ Maulana Nasiruddin 'Umar recited the Khutba in the conqueror's name in the Jama' Masjid of Delhi.¹⁰⁹ Such officers as had distinguished themselves in the campaign were given titles and rewards and the learned and the Saiyyads of Delhi were honoured with presents and robes of honour. Dispatches proclaiming victory in Hindustan were sent to the principal towns of Timūr's empire like Samargand, Tabriz, Shīrāz, Herat and Azerbaijān, together with one hundred and twenty war elephants; and several rhinoceroses as gifts for the princes.¹¹⁰ The conqueror's flag was hoisted on the city walls and drums were beaten to proclaim the new regime. The people of the city lavishly decorated and illuminated their houses and shops.¹¹¹ And then Timūr, who was sixty-three and was to live for only six years more, immersed himself in "pleasure and enjoyment".¹¹²

¹⁰⁶ The date of the construction of this Idgāh is not known, but ■ still exists some 300 yards west of the citadel of Rai Pithora and ¼ mile N.W. of Adham Khan's Tomb at Mahrauli. List., III, Monument No. 133.

¹⁰⁷ Fazlulla Balkhī ■ Naib-i-Mustaufi or Deputy Accountant General in the latter part of the reign of Firōz Shāh, T.F.S. (A), 482. Later ■ he became a partisan of Nāsiruddin Nusrat Shāh, the rival of Sultan Mahmūd Tughlaq, who conferred upon him the title of Qutlugh Khan. T.M.S., 160; Ferishta, I, 155.

¹⁰⁸ M.T., E and D., III, 443; Z.N., II, 116-117.

¹⁰⁹ Sharafuddin (Z.N., II, 118) says: "Maulana Nasiruddin was ordered to go with other learned doctors and proclaim the nam ■ of the Sahib-i-Qirān Amīr Timūr Gurgān in the same way as the name of Firōz Shāh and other Sultans had been proclaimed . . ."

But curiously enough Timūr ■ not strike any coins. Neither the *Memoirs* nor Yazdī make mention of any coins being struck on this occasion ■ even later. Rogers says that no gold or silver pieces of Timūr have been ever found. A small copper coin which he calls *damri* ■ saw in the British Museum collection. It bears the legend *عبدل سلطان تیمور* on the obverse and *عرب بخت دہلی* on the reverse. J.A.S.B., XLII (1883) Pt. I, 59, 62, 63.

Dr. Hoernle came across a gold coin of Timūr, but doubted its genuineness, and published it only as a curio. J.A.S.B., LXVII, 1897, Pt. I, 134-37.

¹¹⁰ Z.N., II, 118; M.T., E and D., III, 444.

¹¹¹ Z.W., III, 907.

¹¹² Z.N., II, 119-20; M.T., E and D., III, 445.

Sack of Delhi

During the course of the day soldiers of the victorious army went in batches into the city. Some went there as an escort to Timūr's consort Chaplān Malik Āgha¹¹³ who wanted to have a view of the Palace of the Thousand Pillars (Qasr-i-Hazār Sitūn),¹¹⁴ others to collect the ransom imposed upon the city while many others to obtain provisions. Trouble started when some soldiers who were purchasing sugar-candy at a shop got rowdy and looted it. Some others tried their hands at other shops.¹¹⁵ Their petty quarrels soon developed into clashes and in no time "the flame of strife" spread to the whole city. On Thursday and the following night nearly 15,000 soldiers were engaged in slaying, plundering, destroying. The next morning the soldiers who had remained outside, too were tempted to share the spoils of their compatriots and rushed into the unfortunate city. It was ruthlessly sacked during the next two days, Friday and Saturday. Gold and silver in coins and bullion, ornaments of women-captives, precious stones and finest fabrics of all kinds were obtained in immense quantities. Even the booty in human flesh and blood was enormous for each soldier had secured a large number of prisoners.¹¹⁶

At last Amīr Timūr woke up to the situation. Unable to restrain his soldiery, he was enraged at the resistance of the people. On Sunday the 21st he ordered Amīr Shāh Malik and Sultan Husain Tawāchī to go into the city and kill the people who had taken shelter in the Jama' Masjid. They were massacred in cold blood and then the entire city was given over to rapine and plunder. Timūr,

¹¹³ Chaplān or Jablān Malik Āgha was a person of rare beauty. 'Arab Shāh describes her 'like a Moon when it is full and the Sun before its setting'. She met her death by execution on the principle: "whether it be true or false, it is a fault which she is suspected". Z.N., II, 186; Houtsma, E.I., IV, 779; Saunders, 310.

¹¹⁴ It was built by Sultan 'Alāuddīn Khaljī in 1303. "This name was given to it because of the large number of pillars utilized in its construction.... The Qasr must have been as magnificent and beautiful as the other buildings of 'Alāuddīn; but unfortunately its complete destruction renders it difficult even to locate its site with any amount of certainty". Lal, *History of the Khaljīs*, 376. Also Arch. Survey of India Report, 1938-39, 142-43.

¹¹⁵ Z.W., III, 907.

¹¹⁶ M.T., E and D, III, 446; Z.N., II, 122.

however, pleaded innocence of all that had happened. With the easy conscience of a conqueror he described the horrible occurrence thus: "By the will of God, and by no wish or direction of mine, all the three cities of Delhi by name Sīrī, Jahānpanāh, and old Delhi, had been plundered. The Khutba of my sovereignty, which is an assurance of safety and protection, had been read in the city. It was therefore my earnest wish that no evil might happen to the people of the place. But it was ordained by God that the city should be ruined. He, therefore, inspired the infidel inhabitants with a spirit of resistance, so that they brought on themselves their own ruin."¹¹⁷ The explanation is as unconvincing as the event was monstrous, and the sack of Delhi will ever remain a blot on Tīmūr's even otherwise also not too clean a career.

Meerut and Hardwar

Without hope of any further gain from the thoroughly sacked city, Tīmūr left it on 31 December, 1398 (22 Rabiul Ākhir)¹¹⁸ and proceeded towards the north. On the way at a village called Katah, Bahādur Nāhar, who had earlier submitted to an officer of the conqueror, arrived with his eldest son Kailāsh to pay respects¹¹⁹ to Tīmūr in person. On 4 January, 1399, Tīmūr arrived at Meerut, a renowned city and fort.¹²⁰ Its governor, Malik Ilyās Afghan,¹²¹ was an adherent of Nusrat Shāh, and undaunted by the fate of Delhi he with Safī and a son of Maulāna Ahmad Thanāsī,¹²² de-

¹¹⁷ M.T., B and D, III, 447.

¹¹⁸ M.T., E and D, III, 448.

¹¹⁹ Z.N., II, 128, has كاتھ. Dowson notes that the Z.N. reads "Kaltash" and "Katash". I agree with Hōdīvala's suggestion that it is Kailāsh. Bahādur Nāhar was a newly converted Jadon Rajput (I.G. XII, 401; Crooke, T.C., III, 233) and it is just possible that his son was known by his Hindu name. He may be identified with Iqlīm Khan, son of Bahādur Nāhar. T.M.S., 175, 179, 181; T.A., I, 260; Hōdīvala, 355.

¹²⁰ Z.N., II, 129.

¹²¹ At places he is called Malik Ilyās. Ferishta, 155, 159; Badaoni, I, 362. اوغلی is mentioned only in R.S., VI, 112.

¹²² The son's name has not been given by any historian. Maulana Ahmad Thanāsī was a pupil of Shaikh Nāsiruddin Chirāgh-i-Delhi. In 'Abdul Haqq Dehlvi's *Ashbār-ul-Akhyār* he is said to have been a great literary figure. He was an Arabic poet and his *Qasida-i-Daliya* is recognized as a classic. He was in Delhi when Tīmūr besieged it and was taken prisoner but afterwards

terminated to defend their charge. Ilyās was confident of his strength, and boasted that even Tarmashirīn Khan had not been able to take Meerut.¹²³ But Timūr was made of different stuff. He gave orders to lay mines under the battlements. His sappers and miners made breaches of ten to fifteen yards under each bastion and wall. Next day Malik Allahād stormed the fort. Escalading its walls, the soldiers entered the citadel and put it to plunder. Sharafuddīn gives an exaggerated and at places ■ incorrect account of the fall of Meerut. According to him Safī was killed in battle while Ilyās was captured and brought before Timūr, together with the remaining "gabrs" and put to the sword while the fort was set ■ fire.¹²⁴ But facts are very different. Ilyās gave ■ determined fight, burnt his womenfolk in the fire of *jauhar*, and did not surrender till the end. Even if Ilyās was captured, he seems to have affected his escape, as later on he rejoined Nusrat Shāh after Timūr's return.

After the reduction of Meerut, Timūr ordered Amīr Jahān Shāh to march with the left wing through the upper regions of the Jumna. He himself marched with Amīr Sulaimān Shāh to ravage the upper and lower regions of the Ganga. Marching alongside the river, at a distance of about fifteen *kos* from Firōzpur,¹²⁵ he fell upon a group

released. He died in 820 H and lies buried at Kalpi. Houtsma, E.I., IV, 738.

■ Tarmashirīn was the son of Dava Khan, ruler of Transoxiana (1272-1306), an avowed enemy of 'Alāuddīn Khaljī (see K.S. Lal, *History of the Khaljis*, 151-175). Tarmashirīn ruled over Transoxiana from 722 to 734 ■ (*Tārīkh-i-Rashidī*, Ney Elias and Ross, Introduction, 49). Muhammad Tughlaq's shifting of the capital and the famine at Delhi gave him ■ welcome opportunity to invade India (Z.W., III, 865). ■ marched into India in 727 H (for a discussion on this date see Dr. Ishwari Prasad, *Qaraunah Turks*, I, 96-97). He harried the entire country extending from Multan to Delhi and sacked Samana and Delhi. Whether ■ not peace was "purchased" by Muhammad bin Tughlaq ■ ■ matter of controversy (see *Qaraunah Turks* and Mahdi Hussain, *Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq*). All the same the invasion proved to be nothing ■ than a passing storm and Meerut felt proud at not having been affected by it.

¹²³ Z.N., II, 130-32.

¹²⁴ Z.N., II, 134; M.T., ■ and D, III, 451. The place is clearly mentioned as Firōzpur in R.S., VI, 113, l. 2, which Thornton mentions to be lying in the district of Muzaffarnagar half a mile from the right bank of the Ganga. Lat. 29° 30' N, Long. 80° 2' E. The Ganga has left its old bed and does not flow past Firōzpur which ■ stated to have been about 20 *kos* below, i.e. south of Tughlaqpur. Elliot, *Races*, II, 28 and 130.

of Hindus who, travelling in forty-six boats, had broken their journey and were encamping on the bank by the riverside.¹²⁶ He attacked them, defenceless though they were, and confiscated their goods. Then making a detour he arrived at Tughlaqpur and fixed his camp there. Timūr halted for the night at Tughlaqpur,¹²⁷ but could not rest there. People were rising everywhere to intercept his march. Amīr Allahadād who was reconnoitring the area informed him that a strong force of 10,000 horse and foot¹²⁸ under the command of one Mubārak Khan was arrayed for a fight on the other side of the river. Timūr crossed the river with his usual alacrity, and fell upon Mubārak. The latter was not prepared for such a surprise and fled, but many of his men were slain.¹²⁹ Meanwhile Shaikha Khokhar had arrived from Lahore with a large force.¹³⁰ To delude the conqueror, he had sent a message that he was only coming to join him, but arriving at close quarters he opened a surprise attack killing several of Timūr's soldiers.¹³¹ But the assailant was defeated and put to flight.

Ilyās Afghān, Saḡī, Mubārak Khan and Shaikha Khokhar were all Muslims, but since they had taken courage to oppose the black-mailer, they were called by him "infidels (*kāfirān va gabrān*)."¹³² As

¹²⁶ Z.N., II, 135. The large number of boats should cause no surprise as navigation on the Ganga was one of the chief means of transportation in those days.

¹²⁷ This Tughlaqpur is not the one situated near Safedon. It is mentioned as a Mahāl of the Sarkar of Saharanpur in the *Āin*. Trs. II, 292. In Elliot's days (circa 1840) the chief town of the pargana of Tughlaqpur was Nūr Nagar because Nūr Jahān is said to have resided there for some time. The pargana was also known as Gobardhanpur (*Races*, II, 131). Today the villages of Tughlaqpur, Nūr Nagar and Gobardhanpur lie 17, 22 and 28 miles respectively north-east of Muzaffarnagar town. Hodivala, 356.

■ Z.N., II, 139; M.T., E and D, III, 453-54; Price, III, 272.

¹²⁸ Z.N., II, 139-141; M.T., E and D, III, 454; R.S., VI, 113.

¹²⁹ The strength of Malik Shaikha's force cannot be ascertained. The figures given by writers vary beyond compromise. Z.N., II, 142 has more than a hundred horse (زراده از صد سوار). Dowson who saw a number of MSS. of the Z.N. writes, (E and D, III, 510 n), "Here one MS., and that the most sober one, magnifies the assailants into 'several thousand desperate men, sword in hand'". The *Muḥḥazāt*, E and D, III, 455. ■ 500 horse and a large force on foot. Mir Khwānd crosses all limits when he declares the force ■ he one hundred thousand horse and foot (صد هزار سوار و پیاده); R.S., VI, 113. ■ statement is just figurative.

¹³¹ Z.N., II, 142-144.

¹³² Z.N., II, 139, 144; R.S., VI, 113.

Pringle Kennedy has rightly pointed out: "It is noticeable in ■■■ of Timūr's type that their holy war does not confine itself to infidels alone. If true Musalmans oppose him, so much the worse for them. They have ceased to be Musalmans and have become of the tribe of *Kāfirs*. They too must be exterminated. In men of his stamp . . . deep in their heart is the belief . . . that opposition to them ■ rebellion against the Most High."¹²²

Timūr arrived at Hardwar, ■ well known place of Hindu pilgrimage on the Ganga, on 12 January, 1399 (5 Jamādī ul Avval). Sharafuddin describes it thus: "Kupila (or Hardwār, probably named after the sage Kapil) is situated at the foot of a mountain by which the river Ganga passes. Fifteen *kos* higher up there is a stone in the form of a cow, and the water of the river flows out of the mouth of that cow."¹²³ This certainly is a reference to Gangotri the source of the Ganga, and the distance should be 50 rather than 15 *kos*. The chronicler continues, "The infidels of India worship this cow, and come hither from all quarters, from distances even of a year's journey, to visit it. They bring here and cast into the river the ashes of their dead. They throw gold and silver into the river and perform their oblations leg deep in the stream."¹²⁴ This was a good reason for its sack by a champion of Islam, but the most important ■■■ to be that "in this valley there was a large concourse of Hindus, having great riches in cattle and moveables."¹²⁵ However, since the people of Hardwar were determined not to surrender without desperate resistance, Timūr thought it fit to organise his troops for a regular battle. He "massed all the wings of his army together" and charged with great vigour. According to the *Zafar Nāmā* the Hindus began to flee soon after,¹²⁷ but the details given in the *Mulfūsāt* clearly show that the people gave a very tough fight.¹²⁸ Later events also show that Timūr's attack was not a complete success. He left Hardwar the same day crossing the Ganga before the afternoon, marching back five *kos* down the river before encamping.¹²⁹ Never before had he taken such a precipitate action.

¹²² *The History of the Great Mughals*, I, 80.

¹²³ Z.N., II, 145.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 145-46; ■ and D, III, 311-12; also M.T., E and D, III, 458.

¹²⁵ Z.N., II, 147.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 147.

■ E and D, III, 460.

¹²⁸ Havell, *Aryan Rule in India*, 376-77.

The Return Journey

Surprisingly enough it was after this not so easy victory that Tīmūr thought of leaving Hindustan. His almost sudden decision to depart was due to many reasons. Famine and pestilence raged in the countryside devastated by him. None of his sons, officers and men, were anxious to continue the thankless task of waging wars against the infidels. On the other hand, satiated with blood-bath and plunder, they were anxious to return home to enjoy the fruits of the campaign. Tīmūr himself was sixty-three years of age and a victim of rheumatism. But the most compelling reason seems to be the trouble that was brewing in many parts of his empire. It was on the banks of the Ganga that Tīmūr had been informed by his swift messengers of the disturbance which had arisen on the confines of Georgia and Anatolia, of the revolt of the Christians, and the ambitious designs of Sultan Bāyazīd.¹⁴⁰ Revolt simmered along the Caucasus, and Bāyazīd had occupied all Mesopotamia.¹⁴¹ Tīmūr, who had no intention of founding an empire in India, could hardly stay there after receiving such alarming news from his homeland.

So he set out on his homeward journey. To avoid any conflicts, he chose a safe route along the foot of the Himalayan hills. Still, wherever he went, he did not fail to inflict some more damage and loot some more wealth. Consequently, even during the return journey campaigning and killing went on on as large a scale as during his onward march, to the disgust of some of his own nobles like Amīr Sulaimān Shāh, Amīr Shāh Malik and Amīr Shaikh Nūruddīn.¹⁴² To their protest Tīmūr gave the usual reply now couched in clearer terms. "My principal object," said he, "in coming to Hindustān had been to accomplish two things. The first was to war with the infidels and to acquire some claim to reward in the life to come. The other was to give a chance to the army of Islam to gain something by plundering the wealth and valuables of the infidels; plunder in war is as lawful as their mother's milk to the Musalmans."¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ Gibbon, II, 1240.

¹⁴¹ Harold Lamb, *Tamerlane the Earth Shaker*, 180.

¹⁴² M.T., E and D, III, 461.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 461-62; also R.S., VI, 114.

It is here that we find ■ explanation for the conqueror's abnormal cruelties. If he could say his prayers amidst corpses and towers of skulls, it was not because he was a maniac who delighted in the destruction of his own species. He did it as a suppliant to God who had given him ■ opportunity to destroy the infidels and glorify Islam. He felt that he was a benefactor of humanity and through violence and bloodshed was purging the world of infidelity and wickedness. That is why a ■■■■■ meant to him an act of grace for which he prostrated himself in thanksgiving.

The Amīr's remaining acts of violence and destruction may be briefly stated. He had left the banks of the Ganga and moved towards the Jumna,¹⁴⁶ where Amīr Jahān Shāh, who had been commissioned to sack that region¹⁴⁶ joined him. They now marched along the foot of the Himalayas. In a valley of the Siwālik hills there was ■ Rai named Bahrōz whose little principality yielded ■ revenue of one lac dangs,¹⁴⁶ small copper coins in circulation since the early days of Turkish rule. Tīmūr sacked it on Saturday, 17 January, 1399 (10 Jamadiul Awwal, 801 H), but the chroniclers exaggerate the success into a major victory¹⁴⁷ in which immense booty in valuables, slaves and cattle ■■■ obtained. The army encamped between the villages of Bakri (modern Bhogpur) and Māyāpur, both situated to the south of Hardwar.¹⁴⁸ Four days later Tīmūr crossed the Jumna and attacked another valley situated

¹⁴⁶ Price, III, 277 n.

¹⁴⁶ Z.N., II, 151.

¹⁴⁶ Although the language in the various texts is not very clear, the sense is clear enough.

¹⁴⁷ Z.N., II, 152-154.

¹⁴⁸ Z.N., II, 154 has موضع بیره که در نواحی بکری و بدھراہرہ (In the Mauza of Bahra, which was in the vicinity of Bakri, better known as the country of Māyāpur). Bakri ■ most probably modern Bhogpur. Bhogpur and Baghra are mentioned as parganas in the Sarkar of Saharanpur (Ain. Tr., II, 291). The town of Bhogpur lies about 10 miles south of Hardwar. The village of Baghra which was four kos from Sikk-sar is not easily identified. It may be Badhera, a village situated about 5 miles south-east of Sarasawa. Shiqq-i-Sarasawa or Sirsawa lies about ten miles W.N.W. of Saharanpur on the route to Ambala, Lat. 30° 1' N. Long. 77° 29' E. Māyāpur is the name of an old ruined town between Hardwar and Kankhal, south of the former. Cunningham derives the name from the old temple of Māyā Dēvī which it contains (A.G.I., 352). It is mentioned in connection with the hills of Bardar (Hardwar) and Bijnor (or Pinjor) in T.M.S. in E and D, III, 353.

between the Siwālik and Gāgar ranges,¹⁴⁰ ruled by Ratan Singh 'of great power and renown'.¹⁴⁰ Without accepting Sharafuddīn's ridiculously exaggerated figures, it can safely be said that in the valley of Bahrōz as well as in the estate of Ratan Singh, Timūr got fresh booty in slaves and cattle.¹⁴¹

According to his chroniclers Timūr next marched to Nagarkot or Kāngrā (in erstwhile Chamba state). Evidently there was a feeling that every Muslim invader or ruler must visit such a centre of Hindu worship with its wondrous Jawālā Mukhī temple. Mahmūd Ghazni, Firōz Tughlaq, Timūr, Akbar, Jahāngir and Aurangzēb all went there. Its scenic beauty was charming and Timūr, in whose time probably the beauties of Kashmir — unknown or inaccessible,¹⁴² also thought of marching through it. *Mulfuzāt's* narrative of this march bears the caption of "Capture of Nagarkot", but this is misleading. Timūr seems to have just passed through Kāngrā, and Megha, the then Katoch Raja of Kāngrā¹⁴³ (A. D. 1390-1403), is not mentioned to have been attacked. The chroniclers are mistaken in saying that Dev Rai whom Timūr attacked later was defeated at Kāngrā.

In the course of a month's campaigning in the Siwālik (16 Jama-diul Awwal to 16 Jamadiul Ākhir), says Sharafuddīn, Timūr had twenty conflicts with the Hindus and had taken seven fortresses.¹⁴⁴ One such was the citadel of Shaikhū, a relation of Malik Shaikhha Khokar. Shaikhū made his submission, but the inhabitants refused to pay the blackmail. To disarm them Timūr had resort to a stratagem. He offered them high prices for their weapons, even for the rusted and damaged ones. When from greed of profit they had sold away all their arms,¹⁴⁵ Timūr asked them to depute forty men to

¹⁴⁰ Z.N., II, 155, has Kūkā कूका. Kūkā may be Karkā or Gargā गर्गा. It is the Gāgar range of our Gazetteers which is also called Garāchal or Gargāchal. It runs along the districts of Almora and Kumaon and presents a line of higher elevation than any ranges between it and the main ridge of the central Himalaya (I.G., XII, 121). The *darra* or valley between — Siwālik (the sub-Himalaya) and the Kūkā or Gārga hills (the outer Himalaya) — probably Dehra Dun or the Kyarda Dun in the south-east portion of the Sirmur State I.G., XXIII, 21.

— M.T., E and D, III, 463. ¹⁴¹ Z.N., II, 156.

¹⁴² J.A.S.B. (letters), IV, 1938, 170. ¹⁴³ Hodivala, II, 142.

¹⁴⁴ Z.N., II, 159-60. ¹⁴⁵ Z.N., II, 161; R.S., VI, 115 last line.

serve under Hindu Shāh, the Master of the Exchequer. Though unarmed they refused to obey the order, and "it became necessary for the soldiers of the faith to exact vengeance",¹⁵⁶ The fort was assaulted; many persons were killed and many others enslaved. Similarly the fort of Deva Rai and five other fortresses were taken with equal ease.¹⁵⁷

After negotiating the Siwālīks, Timūr marched towards Jammu. On 22 February (16 Jamadiul Ākhīr) he arrived at Bailā, situated about twenty miles from the modern Jammu town.¹⁵⁸ The inhabitants of Bailā knew what was in store for them and they escaped into a nearby jungle. Timūr surrounded the forest so closely that no one could come out, and then his soldiers plundered the village undisturbed. Large quantities of grain and fodder were collected, sufficient to supply the requirements of the army,¹⁵⁹ and then the village was set on fire.

At the next halt the Amīr received the envoys whom he had sent to Sikandar Shāh of Kashmir (A. D. 1394-1417). He ■■■ to have been quite pleased with Sikandar who was known as *but shikan* (Iconoclast) and who, according to Cunningham, had used gunpowder in destroying temples.¹⁶⁰ He was, therefore, disappointed to learn from Maulana Nūruddīn, Sikandar's envoy who had been accredited to him, that his master had come as far ■ the village of Jhabān in the vicinity of Jammu¹⁶¹ but on being apprised of the exorbitant demand of the Amīr's revenue officers for supplying 30,000 horses and paying 100,000 gold *tankas*,¹⁶² had returned to

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 160-61; R.S., VI, 116; M.T., E and D, III, 468.

¹⁵⁷ Z.N., II, 161.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 163. Bailā ■■ ten *kos* from the modern Jammu town on the route from Kāngrā to old Jammu which was situated about one *kos* north-east of the modern town. Hodivala, 357-58.

¹⁵⁹ Z.N., II, 163; M.T., E and D, III, 469.

¹⁶⁰ J.A.S.B., XXIII, 1854, 415. This is refuted by Mohibbul Hasan, *Kashmir Under the Sultans*, 65-66.

■ Z.N., II, 164 has چہان. Chibhān is the old name of Bhimbar. (Cunningham, A. G. I., 134; Ain Tr., II, 347 n.) Chibhān or Chibhāl is the country of the Chhibis. It extends from the Manawar Tawi to the Jhelum. I.G., XV, 100.

¹⁶² Z.N., II, has صد هزار دروست زر هر يك بوزن دو مثقال و نیم which means 100,000 durusts of gold, each weighing two and a half Misqāls.

So have R.S., VI, 116 and Ferishta, II, 340. Taking a Misqāl at the average

Srinagar in despair. Timūr was incensed at the demand of his officers and sent Zainuddīn with the envoy to ask Sikandar Shāh to meet him on the Indus on 25 March,¹⁶³ and himself started for Jammu where he arrived on 25 February (19 Jamadiul Ākhir). The people of Jammu were "robust, tall and powerful"¹⁶⁴ but the Raja, to avoid an unnecessary engagement, escaped into the hills. Timūr's men looted the grain markets of Jammu and Bao,¹⁶⁵ lying on the opposite bank of the Tawi. Timūr moved away four *kos*, leaving some troops to ambuscade the Raja when he came down from the mountain ranges. The Raja was attacked and taken prisoner. His wounds were carefully tended "for the sake of getting the ransom money". Later on by "hopes, fears and threats, he was also brought to see the beauty of Islam".¹⁶⁶

Six days later Timūr sent his treasurer Hindu Shāh to Samarqand to announce his return.¹⁶⁷ Hunting rhinoceroses and tigers on the way he continued his march homeward. On 5 March (27 Jamadiul Ākhir) in his camp arrived the contingent¹⁶⁸ which he had sent to Lahore to chastise Shaikhā Khokhar. We have ■■■ that after his defeat by Sārang Khan and expulsion from Lahore Shaikhā had made his submission to Timūr and joined his camp. But after the death of Sārang Khan at the hands of Timūr, he had fled from the latter's camp and reoccupied Lahore.¹⁶⁹ He had weight of 70 to 72 grains, the *durust* (correct weight) *tanika* of gold ■■■ be of 175 to 180 grains. Ferishta ■■■ therefore quite correct when he says that the amount demanded ■■■ 100,000 Ashrafs of 'Alāuddīn, because the *tanika* of 'Alāuddīn (clearly referred to in the *Mulfiusā*, ■■■ and D, III, 470) was of 175 grains or two and a half Misqāls.

For 'Alāuddīn's *tanika* ■■■ Thomas, *Chronicles*, 158, 160-61; Nelson Wright, 72 and Lal, *History of the Khaljis*, 270-71.

In view of this the 'one hundred thousand golden dirhams' of C.H.I., III, 279, are not correct.

¹⁶³ Z.N., II, 154-65; M.T., E and D, III, 469-70. Sikandar later had set out from Srinagar, but when he learnt at Barāmūl that Timūr had hurriedly left for Samarqand, he returned to his capital. Ferishta (Urdu Tr.), II, 547.

¹⁶⁴ Z.N., II, 166.

■ Z.N., II, 166 has *Manu* or *Manu* is a misreading of *Bao* or *Bhao* which is shown in Constable, Pl. 25 A a. *Bao* ■■■ said to have been founded and named after two brothers. Cunningham, A.G.I., 133.

¹⁶⁵ Z.N., II, 168-69; M.T., E and D, III, 472; R.S., VI, 116.

¹⁶⁶ Z.N., II, 172.

¹⁶⁷ M.T., ■■■ and D, III, 475.

¹⁶⁸ J.A.S.B., XL, Pt. I, 1871, 80.

paid no attention to Hindu Shāh when the latter had passed through Lahore on his way from Samargand to join his master in India. Worse still he had even made ■ attack on Tīmūr between Meerut and Hardwar. Tīmūr had consequently sent an expedition under Pīr Muhammad who on arrival at Lahore attacked the place, collected the ransom money and took prisoner Shaikhā Khokhar and his son Jasrat Khokhar.¹⁷⁰

At a Durbar held on 5 March, 1399 (27 Jamādīul Ākhir 801 H)¹⁷¹ Shaikhā Khokhar was beheaded.¹⁷² This was the last court Tīmūr held in India and it was probably ■ this very Durbar that Khizr Khan was appointed governor of Multan, Deopapur and Lahore¹⁷³ on the conqueror's behalf.

Now Tīmūr released most of the prisoners he had made in Delhi, not necessarily because of the intercession of Shaikh Ahmad Khattu as is claimed by certain historians,¹⁷⁴ but probably to lighten his burden. However, all the artisans, skilled mechanics, craftsmen and builders and even consignments of some stores were ordered to be taken home for building a Jāma' Masjid in his mud-walled Samargand, which he wanted to beautify.¹⁷⁵ Tīmūr had been highly impressed by the Jāma' Masjid of Delhi constructed of polished marble by Firōz Shāh, and took ■ model of it home.¹⁷⁶ He also admired the Qutb Minār and carried off workmen to construct a similar one in Samargand, which intention, however, was never carried out.¹⁷⁷

Then by successive marches Amīr Tīmūr Gūrgān returned to his native land. About five years later he died in March, 1405, and was buried in a splendid mausoleum built by his captive craftsmen.¹⁷⁸

■ Z.N., II, 169.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 175.

¹⁷² Ferishta, I, 159.

¹⁷³ Z.N. II, 175-76; Ferishta, I, 159.

¹⁷⁴ T.A., De's trs., I, 280 n. Commissariat, I, 56-57. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 357-58: "Shaikh Khattu's tomb is well known at Sarkhez in Gujarat near Ahmedabad". For a brief sketch of the life of Shaikh Ahmad Khattu (Khatiri), see Bayley, *History of Gujarat*, 90-91.

¹⁷⁵ *Narrative of the Embassy of Clavijo to the Court of Tīmūr* (Markham) Hakluyt Society, 1859. Percy Brown, *Indian Architecture* (Islamic Period), 26. Also *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, XXIII, 399-400.

¹⁷⁶ Price, III (I), 267.

¹⁷⁷ Harold Lamb, 272.

¹⁷⁸ Havell, *Aryan Rule in India*, 377.

Visitation in Retrospect

A careful study of Timūr's invasion leads to the conclusion that it symbolises little more than the fulfilment of an ambition without a distinct object. After all why did he invade India? If conquest of the country was his object, he had certainly not achieved it. The fact of the matter was that Sultan Mahmūd and Iqbāl Khan were alive and unsubdued. According to himself and his chroniclers it was to destroy idolatry and to obtain a rich booty that he had invaded India. Now so far as his destruction of idolatry is concerned, there is no mention of the razing of any temples in the course of his Indian campaign. What we may gather from the writings of his historians is that not only was he lukewarm in this direction, but on the other hand he had in his army Turks who worshipped and carried their idols with them, and "men who worshipped fire, soothsayers and unbelievers".¹⁷⁹ This was because Timūr observed the precepts of Chingiz Khan and preferred them to the laws of Islam;¹⁸⁰ so that two doctors, Hafizuddin Muhammad Bazāzi and 'Alāuddin Muhammad Bukhārī declared that he should be considered an infidel.¹⁸¹ Sure enough, contemporary opinion was sceptic about his avowed profession of Islam.

To the complacent mind of the conqueror, he had come to wage war against the infidels. But the fact is that Hindu rulers in northern India, save in Rajputana, were no more than petty landlords and defeat of a few of them had little effect on Hinduism in India. On the contrary, the overthrow of the Muslim Sultan of Delhi and its terrible sack wrought much harm to the strength of Muhammadan rule and gave rise to a number of strong Hindu kingdoms. "No wonder then that warriors fighting against Timūr are given the rank of martyrs by the Indian Muhammadan historians"¹⁸² and the ruthless conqueror is himself cursed as an "infidel" by the Muhammadans.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁹ Saunders, *Tamerlane the Great*, 321.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 298-99. Also Z.N., II, 29, 30 and M.T., E and D, III, 408.

¹⁸¹ Saunders, 299.

¹⁸² Pringle Kennedy, I, 97.

¹⁸³ An inscription on the Idgāh built by Mallū Iqbāl Khan in A.D. 1404-5 (807 H) on the east side of the Delhi-Qutb Road, 200 yards to the south

One cannot again be sure of Amīr Tīmūr's gains in terms of gold. The wealth that Mahmūd of Ghaznī had carried away from India had impressed all contemporary historians. Mahmūd himself ■■■ dazed by the booty he had collected. The wealth 'Alāuddīn Khaljī brought from the Deccan, again, had amazed the contemporary historians whose computation of it varied both in description and in imagery. But Tīmūr's booty did not attract much notice. The motive of loot is certain, but how much was looted is not so certain.

Still more amazing is the haste with which Tīmūr returned to his country. He did have problems in Samarqand needing his immediate attention, but this does not justify his indifference to receiving tribute from the king of Kashmir, or his surrendering the reins of his acquisitions into the hands of Khizr Khan, without leaving any army to help him. He left the country as if he had nothing more to do with it. More than ■ century later a descendant of his house found it convenient to lay claim to Hindustan on the basis of Tīmūr's victory, but ■■■ is compelled to conclude that in spite of what he or his chroniclers have written, his was an aimless visitation, and its memory lingered for long. The victor had hardly gained much, but the vanquished had lost everything. The Sultan of Delhi was a fugitive, the nobles ■■■ dispersed, and the Tughlaq monarchy, which had rapidly declined during the last decade, was ■■■ beyond any hope of redemption.

But ■■■ in the deepest darkness light persists. Tīmūr's gruesome invasion had a silver lining. Hindus and Muslims all stood up to a man to fight him wherever he went. The days of Mahmūd of Ghaznī were a story of the past, and Tīmūr met resistance everywhere. The people of India were known for their disunity in the face of a foreign invader. But they stood united against Tīmūr. At Tulamba, Ajodhan, Deopulpur, Bhatnir, Meerut and Delhi—nay everywhere—the Hindus and Muslims fought shoulder to shoulder against the

of village Kharera, reads : *چون بنه السلام دارالمالك دهل في بلاد ممالك از شر مثل ملاين و* فساد كثره و شياطين دوى جزاي آورده - ("When the pious city of Delhi, the metropolis of the country, was desolated by the evil of the accursed Mughals and the mischief of the infidels and Satans... Iqbāl Khan... ■■■ able... to repopulate the capital of Delhi and other parts of the country"). *List of Monuments*, ■■■ (Mahrauli Zail), 164-66.

invader. Shaikh Sa'āduddīn interceded with Timūr on behalf of the Hindu chief of Bhatnir. At Meerut, Ilyās Afghān, a Muslim, burnt his womenfolk in the fire of *jauhar*. During Timūr's visitation the Hindus and Muslims learnt to sink their differences and stand united.

Chapter 3

BID FOR THE THRONE

TIMUR HAD CONVERTED the north-western Hindustan into ■ shambles. The countryside through which he had passed, suffered terribly from famine and pestilence. For full two months after his departure, Delhi "presented a scene of desolation and woe".¹ In that unfortunate city those who had escaped from the sword, succumbed to hunger and disease.² Decomposing corpses polluted the air and pestilence took its toll mercilessly. Agriculture and industry stood still and the morale of the people went under. The few officers and men that the invader had left behind either fell a prey to pestilence or otherwise at the earliest took the road to Kabul.³ The vacuum so created was not immediately filled. The absence of strong political authority encouraged military adventurers who harried the land for self-aggrandisement. Besides, a number of nobles and "sultans" made a bid for the throne, and it took full fifteen years to form ■ stable government at Delhi. In these circumstances the suffering of the people during this period ■ better be imagined than described.

Iqbāl Khan

On Tīmūr's departure from Delhi, Nāsiruddīn Nusrat Shāh the Pretender, who during his invasion had escaped into the Doab, now finding the field clear, decided to make an attempt for the throne.⁴ Encouraged by 'Ādil Khan of Meerut,⁵ he occupied the palace of Firōzābād, which ■ still in ruins, and sent Shihāb Khan of Mewāt against Mallū Iqbāl Khan who was at Baran. But Shihāb was defeated and killed by Iqbāl Khan with the help of the Hindu zamindars of the Doab over whom he had influence, and the latter proceeded towards Delhi in the middle of January, 1399 (Jamādīul Avval 801 H).⁶ About now, Nāsiruddīn Nusrat

¹ T.M.S., 167; T.A., I, 256.

² Badaoni, Ranking, I, 359.

³ Z.W., III, 908.

⁴ T.M.S., 167; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 359.

⁵ T.M.S., 167.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 168.

suddenly died, and Delhi quietly passed into the hands of Iqbal Khan. He made Siri his headquarters.⁷ People who had migrated to various places during Timūr's upheaval, now started returning to Siri which again began to show signs of life.⁸

Iqbal Khan had under his sway only the capital city and its environs. The empire had been parcelled out into independent kingdoms. Sindh and the Punjab were under Khizr Khan. Gujarat was ruled by Zafar Khan Wajihul Mulk and Malwa by Dilāwar Khan. Nearer home, at Samana, ruled Ghālib Khan and at Bayana, Shams Khan Auhadī. Mahoba and Kalpi were under Mahmūd Khan, ■■■ of Malikzādā Firōz. In the east, the region from Qannauj to Bihar comprising of Sandilah, Dalmaū, Kara, Avadh, Bahraich and Jaunpur was under Mubārak Shāh Qaranfūl, an adopted son of Khwājā Jahān. Every one of these cast his greedy eyes on the Capital of the Sultanate.

With Delhi ■■■ his hands, Iqbal Khan became keen to reclaim ■■■ much of the lost territory of the Sultanate ■■■ possible. Paucity of resources, however, prevented him from undertaking any major operations. In November, 1399 (Rabiul Avval 802 H)⁹ he marched to Bayana against its ruler Shams Khan Auhadī. He defeated him between Nūh and Tappal,¹⁰ but did not occupy Bayana¹¹ and pushed on to Katehar.¹² After exacting tribute from its ruler Rai Vira Singh,¹³ Iqbal Khan returned to Delhi.

⁷ Siri was built by Sultan 'Alāuddīn Khaljī in 1303 ■■■ a village of the same name. It was situated about three miles to the N.E. of the Qutb Minār. The fort was still under construction when the Mongols invaded India. They were completely defeated, ■■■ the heads of ■■■ 8,000 of them were used ■■■ bricks in the construction of the walls. Timūr has described Siri in detail. In 1548 Sher Shāh destroyed this city of 'Alāuddīn. Lal, *History of the Khaljīs*, 375-76.

⁸ T.M.S., 168; T.A., I, 257.

⁹ T.M.S., 168-69 and T.A., I, 257 have the above date. Ferishta has 803 H.

¹⁰ T.M.S., 169 has جٹ و جٹ. Badaoni, Ranking I, 359, has Nūh and Patal. The correct names are Nūh and Tappal. Nūh is now in Gurgaon district and Tappal is a pargana in Khair. Both are indicated in Constable, pl. 27 C a. Nūh ■■■ 40 miles S.W. of Delhi and Tappal 31 miles S.W. of Aligarh. Hodivala, 397.

¹¹ T.M.S., 169; Ferishta, I, 159.

¹² Also see Thomas, *Chronicles*, 325 n. 2.

¹³ T.M.S., 169, and Badaoni, Ranking I, 359 have Harsing. Ferishta, I,

These minor successes encouraged Iqbāl to try his strength with the more powerful kingdom of Jaunpur. It may be recalled that Sultan Nāsiruddīn Mahmūd had appointed Malik Sarwar, a talented eunuch, ■ the governor of Jaunpur in A. D. 1394 and had conferred upon him the title of Malikul Sharq (Master of the East). The brave and sagacious Khwājā brought the recalcitrant zamindars of U. P. and Bihar under control; but taking advantage of the declining power of the Sultanate he extended his influence up to Kol (Aligarh) and Rapri in the west and Tirhut in the east. He grew so powerful as to realise the tribute which the rulers of Bengal used to send to Delhi. There was nothing to stop him from assuming the title of Sultan, but he thought it prudent not to issue any coins in his name, and a Bihar inscription records that he did not assume the insignia of royalty.¹⁴ Khwājā Jahan died in A. D. 1399. He was succeeded by his adopted son Malik Wāsil who, because of his extremely dark complexion, earned the nickname of Qaranfūl (clove). He adopted the title of Sultan Mubārak Shāh.¹⁵ Iqbāl Khan could not forget that Jaunpur had not come to the aid of Delhi when Timūr had attacked it; at least he could not brook Mubārak adopting the title of Sultan and striking coins in his own name.¹⁶ Consequently he left for Qannauj, a dependency of Jaunpur, in December-January, 1400-1401 (Jamadiul Avval 803 H).¹⁷ On the way he was joined by Shams Khan Auhādī (who was obliged to Iqbāl Khan for leaving him in possession of Bayana), Mubārak Khan and Bahadur Nāhar of Mewat. When the allies reached Patiali,¹⁸ on the Kalindī (also known as Kālī Nadī or Āb-i-Siyāh),¹⁹

159 and T.A. have Nar Singh. He was Vira Sinha who took possession of Gwalior consequent on the confusion created by Timūr. Arch. Sur. Rep., II, 381. Hodivala, 394.

¹⁴ J.A.S.B., 1873, 270. Also Ferishta, II, 304. E.I., *Arabic and Persian Supplement*, 1961, 32-34.

¹⁵ T.M.S., 169; Ferishta, I, 159.

¹⁶ Ferishta, II, 304, says that Mubārak Shāh struck coins, but ■ coins of his have been found. J.A.S.B., XVIII, 1922, Numismatic Supplement XXXVI, N 14.

¹⁷ T.M.S., 169; Ferishta, II, 304; T.A., I, 257.

¹⁸ Badaoni and T.A. have Baitali. Patiali lies ■ ■ old bank of the Ganga 22 miles N.E. of Etah in 27° 42' N. and 72° 5' E. *District Gaz. Etah*, 201.

¹⁹ Or "Black Water". It refers to Kalini ■ Kalnadi, a corruption of the ancient Kalindī. It is a tributary of the Ganga and is the chief river of Etawah

they were opposed by Rai Sumēr Singh of Etawah and other Zamin-dars of the vicinity who were determined to make capital out of the wretched condition of the Sultanate. But Sumēr was defeated; he retreated to Etawah and Iqbāl Khan resumed his march. His plan was to take Qannauj and then march out to occupy Lucknow and Jaunpur;²⁰ but Mubārak Shāh Sharqī checked his advance at Qannauj where he had arrived with his army. The two forces lay facing each other for full two months on either side of the Ganga, but neither dared to ford the river to fight. Indeed, Shams Khan Auhadī and Mubārak Khan were playing a treacherous game, and this made Iqbāl Khan order a retreat.²¹ At this the Sharqī king also returned to Jaunpur.

It was now clear to Iqbāl Khan that there were sections of people in and around Delhi who were not willing to recognise his authority. Besides Khizr Khan was making preparations in Multan for a bid for the Sultanate. In these circumstances Iqbāl Khan thought it best to invite Sultan Mahmūd to Delhi. It may be recalled that after his defeat at the hands of Tīmūr, Mahmūd had secretly fled towards Gujarat. Though Muzaffar Shāh, the then ruler of Gujarat, gave every help to the refugees from Delhi who had flocked at Pātan, he did not encourage Sultan Mahmūd himself to come there perhaps because he apprehended peril to his position. Sorely disappointed, Mahmūd made his way to Malwa where he was welcomed by Dillāwar Khan.²² He was at Dhar when Iqbāl Khan, thinking that he would be of use to him, invited him to return.²³ Placed as he was, Mahmūd was quick to respond, and returned to Delhi in A. D. 1401 (804 H). He was cordially welcomed by Iqbāl Khan who lodged

district. It flows between Jumna and Ganga. Hunter, *Imp. Gaz.*, VII, 327. Ferishta, I, 160, has Nahr-i-Gang.

²⁰ Ferishta, I, 159.

²¹ T.M.S., 170; T.A., I, 258; Ferishta, I, 160, II, 304-5. On his way back to Delhi, Iqbāl Khan got Shams Khan Auhadī and Mubārak Khan murdered — he suspected their loyalty.

²² Ferishta, II, 181. The author of *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, 15, indulges in an anachronism in saying that Mahmūd went to Alp Khan in Malwa. Alp Khan was the — of Dillāwar Khan and succeeded him in 1405 with the title of Hoehang Shāh. Lanepoole, *Local Muhammedan Dynasties*, 310; Ferishta, II, 181, 234; *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 47; Bayley, *Gujarat*, 79; Commissariat, I, 56.

²³ Ferishta, I, 160; II, 234.

the Sultan in the palace of Jahan Panāh.²⁴ But Mahmūd was not satisfied with the mere show of loyalty on the part of Iqbāl who virtually retained the reins of government in his own hands.²⁵ Indeed it was too much to expect of the latter to surrender power which he had been enjoying for more than three years, though it may be said to his credit that he ruled only in the [] of the Sultan.²⁶ Even so the gulf between the two went on widening and shortly after an incident completed the rupture.

Encouraged by the arrival of Sultan Mahmūd, Mallū Iqbāl thought it opportune to settle accounts with Jaunpur, and taking Mahmūd with him he started for Qannauj in A. D. 1402. On the way they learnt that Mubārak Shāh Sharqī had died at Jaunpur.²⁷ Iqbāl Khan could not have hoped for better news. But Ibrāhīm Sharqī who had succeeded Mubārak²⁸ was no less warlike than his deceased brother,²⁹ and hearing of Iqbāl Khan's movements, he came up to the Ganga³⁰ and fought a few skirmishes with the Delhi army. As the two forces lay facing each other Sultan Mahmūd, to whom the gilded bonds at Delhi had become too galling, left on the pretence of going on a hunting expedition and went over to Ibrāhīm Sharqī in the hope of securing his help in removing his aggressive friend. But disappointment lay in store for him because Ibrāhīm did not treat him well. It would have been foolish for him to go back to Iqbāl, and so he avenged himself on the Sharqī ruler by attacking and occupying Qannauj where he began to reside. His defection weakened Iqbāl Khan's position and he returned to Delhi, while the newly crowned king of Jaunpur acquiescing in Mahmūd's occupation of Qannauj, probably because it provided a distraction to Iqbāl Khan, also went back to Jaunpur. Iqbāl Khan

²⁴ T.M.S., 170. "This was the name given to the central portion of the triple citadel of Delhi with Siri. It was situated in the midst of the inhabited city, and had thirteen gates; of the other two Siri had seven gates, and old Delhi ten gates". Badaoni, Ranking, I, 361. Also [] and D, III, 448.

²⁵ T.M.S., 170-171; T.A., I, 258; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 361; Ferishta, I, 160.

²⁶ In an inscription dated 807 H. (A.D. 1404-5) on the Idgāh built by Iqbāl Khan, he chose to be called "Sultān" or Slave of the Sultan. Arch. Sur. Rep. IV, 65, List, 154-66.

²⁷ T.M.S., 171; T.A., I, 258. [] Ferishta, II, 305.

²⁸ T.M.S., 171. [] Ferishta, II, 305.

could never forgive Sultan Mahmūd's "treachery", and three years later he led an attack against Gannauj.

Meanwhile, in pursuance of his policy of retrieving Delhi's prestige, Iqbāl Khan marched against Gwalior in December, 1402 (Jamadiul Avval 805 H). During the confusion following Timūr's invasion, Gwalior had become independent under its Tomar ruler, Vīra Singh. After his death his grand-nephew or grandson Virama Deva had become master of Gwalior.³¹ Since Gwalior formed a part of the Sultanate from almost its very inception, Mallū Iqbāl decided to reoccupy it. He marched to Gwalior, laid siege to the fort, but failed to take it. In impotent rage he laid waste its outlying regions. Next year he made another attempt against it, but was compelled to return to Delhi achieving almost next to nothing.³²

During A. D. 1403 (806 H) Iqbāl Khan did not think it safe to move out of Delhi. Dangers threatened him from various quarters.

³¹ Chronicles have again made a mistake about this Hindu name. Yahya calls him Bīram Deo. Ferishta has Baram Deo. He was Virama Deva. Virama was not the son but the grandson or grandnephew of Vīra Singh as is clear from the dynastic list of the Tomar Rajas. A pillar on which these names are inscribed still exists outside the fort of Narwar. They are in the following order :

- (1) Vīra Singh.
- (2) Uddhāran Dēva son or brother of (1).
- (3) Virama, son of (2).
- (4) Ganapati Deva, son of (3).
- (5) Durgarēndra Deva (Dūngar Singh), son of (4).
- (6) Kīrti Singh, son of (5).
- (7) Kalyānmal, son of (6).
- (8) Māna (Mān Singh), son of (7).
- (9) Vikram Sāhi (Vikramāditya), son of (8).
- (10) Rama Sāhi, son of (9).
- (11) Salivāhan, son of (10).

Several other inscriptions of these princes have been found. There are three of Virama Deva (A.D. 1408-1410), one of Durgarēndra or Dūngar Singh (1440-1453), five of Kīrti Singh (1468-1473) and two of Mān Singh (1486-1517). I.G., XVIII, 397; Cunningham, Arch. Sur. Rep., II, 396. Hodivala, 398.

³² T.M.S., 172; Ferishta, I, 160 and T.A., I, 259 say that he returned without taking the fort. The dynastic list of the Tomar Rajas of Gwalior also shows that the latter went on ruling for decades later. But Badaoni wrongly declares that Iqbāl Khan "wresting it (the fort of Gwalior) from the possession of 'Virama' took it into his own control". Badaoni, Ranking, I, 361.

In the west Khizr Khan was making feverish preparations to capture Delhi. In the east Ibrāhīm Sharqī was as strong as ever and Sultan Mahmūd was in no mood for reconciliation. But the greatest threat was the impending invasion from Gujarat.³³ No prince knew more about the deplorable condition of Delhi than Tātār Khan, son of Muzaffar Shāh, ruler of Gujarat; and none perhaps was better placed to plan an invasion of Delhi since Gujarat was situated at too safe a distance for secrets to reach Delhi. To follow the situation it is necessary to throw a retrospective glance at the relations between Delhi and Gujarat. Tātār Khan had been appointed vazīr by Sultan Muhammad Shāh bin Firōz Tughlaq, and the Government of Gujarat was conferred upon his father Zafar Khan in 1391.³⁴ With the death of Sultan Muhammad affairs at Delhi fell into chaos, and Tātār Khan readily plunged himself into the intrigue for power. He fought Sārāng Khan and compelled him to retire to Multan,³⁵ but Iqbāl Khan foiled all his attempts to occupy Delhi.³⁶ Tātār Khan fled to his father at Patan in 1398 and constantly instigated the latter to attack Delhi. Muzaffar organised an army for the purpose,³⁷ but postponed the expedition on hearing of Tīmūr's arrival in India. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the ruler of Gujarat did not afford shelter to the fugitive king of Delhi, Sultan Mahmūd.

After Tīmūr's avalanche had subsided, Tātār Khan again urged his father to seize the capital of the Sultanate. Muzaffar was now sixty,³⁸ and was reluctant to enter upon any hazardous enterprise. Seeing his father's reluctance the highly ambitious Tātār imprisoned him in 1403 (Jamādī ul Avval 806 H) and crowned himself³⁹ at Asāwal⁴⁰ with the title of Nāsiruddīn Muhammad

³³ T.A., I, 259.

³⁴ Commissariat, I, 55; *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 47. Also see Chapter I.

³⁵ Ferishta, II, 180-181.

³⁶ *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī*, 14.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 14, 17; *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 47.

³⁸ Commissariat, I, 57.

³⁹ T.M.S., 172; Ferishta, II, 181; T.A., I, 259; *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 47.

⁴⁰ Before Ahmedabad was built in 1411, Asāwal, in its vicinity, was one of the very important towns of northern Gujarat. Alberūnī mentions it and Idrīsī refers to it as populous, rich and industrial. Baranī, Yabiyā, Nizāmuddīn Ahmad and the author of *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī* also write about it. It appears that Asāwal was situated outside the city walls of Ahmedabad, to its south, beyond the Jamalpur gate. Bayley, *Gujarat*, 427-28; Commissariat, I, 59-60. T.M.S., 172, has Broach in place of Asāwal.

Shāh.⁴¹ Thereafter he started feverish preparations for an attack on Delhi, and it was this news which gave ■■ anxious time to Iqbāl Khan.⁴² But fate had willed otherwise. Muzaffar Shāh appealed to his brother Shams Khan, the vazīr of Tātār Khan, asking him to kill his treacherous ■■ and release him from confinement. Accordingly Shams Khan poisoned his nephew at Sinor⁴³ while he was about to leave for a campaign against Delhi.⁴⁴ Muzaffar once more assumed the reins of government, and the plan to invade Delhi was given up.

But the recession of the threat from Gujarat hardly provided any relief to Iqbāl Khan for, in Sindh, Khizr Khan was gathering strength day by day. He ■■ a potential danger to the ruler of Delhi. Besides being "one of the principal men of Hindustan", he was widely recognised ■■ the rightful successor of Tīmūr in India. While making his plans both for the present and future, Khizr Khan could not ignore the implications of Tīmūr's legacy of bitterness and hatred among the masses and classes. His benefactor had left him with a kingdom but without any army. To make up this deficiency he invited the Afghan chiefs in India and from beyond the Indus to join his cause. Adventurous by nature, the Afghans found a good opportunity for advancement in the service of Khizr Khan and flocked to his banner in large numbers. He could depend upon their loyalty and they, on their side, could secure a strong position in the country if and when their support brought him success. In the east the powerful kingdom of Jaunpur posed another

⁴¹ *Mitrā-i-Sikandart*, 16-17, relates that Muzaffar ■■ abdicated in favour of his son Tātār Khan, but afterwards repented at having done so, and caused him to be poisoned. But Ferishta, II, 181-182, disbelieves it, and gives detailed circumstances of Muzaffar's imprisonment and Tātār's assassination.

⁴² *Mitrā-i-Ahmadī*, I, 48.

■ "Sinor is the headquarters of the *isluka* of the same name in the Baroda *pradēś* of the Gaekwar's territories. The town is picturesquely situated on the steep banks of the Narbada and a noble flight of 100 steps leads from the houses to the waterside". Commissariat, I, 57 n.

⁴⁴ Ferishta, II, 181; Badaonī, Ranking, I, 361. Tātār Khan ■■ buried at Patan.

Strangely enough Yahyā speaks very highly of Tātār Khan and credits him with a "disposition commendable and qualities angelic". T.M.S., 172. It is also averred that Muzaffar continued to weep for his son till the day of ■■ death. Bird's *Gujarat*, 182.

perennial problem. Qannauj, ruled by Sultan Mahmūd, provided another source of distraction to Iqbāl Khan. Besides being sandwiched between the powerful rulers of Sindh and Jaunpur, Iqbāl Khan was also faced with the recalcitrance of the independent chiefs of the Doab as well as the coalition of the Rajas of Gwalior and Etawah.

With such problems staring him in the face, Iqbāl Khan could not just sit quiet. He was compelled to be active. The prospects of expansion in the east or west being almost entirely closed, he occupied himself in subduing the independent chiefs of the Doab, it being incumbent upon any ruler of Delhi to occupy that region at least. In A. D. 1404 (807 H), therefore, he marched against Rai Sumār, Rai Virama Deva of Gwalior and Rai Jalbahār⁴⁵ who had formed a coalition and had shut themselves up in the fortress of Etawah.⁴⁶ After a siege of four months, peace was made with them but without any decisive gains to Iqbāl Khan.⁴⁷ From Etawah, Iqbāl Khan proceeded to Qannauj against Sultan Mahmūd in April, 1405 (Shawwāl, 807 H), but the fort being too strong he returned to Delhi after fighting only a few skirmishes.⁴⁸

Having failed in the east, Iqbāl Khan thought of trying his luck in the west. At Samana ruled Bahrām Khan Turkbachchā, a slave of Sultan Firōz,⁴⁹ who had formerly become hostile to Sārang Khan⁵⁰ and was now in league with Khizr Khan. He must be subdued and if Khizr Khan could be defeated it would be ideal. In January 1405 (Sh'abān 807 H) Iqbāl had already received the news of Tīmūr's death,⁵¹ and the happy tidings must have elated him and encouraged him to settle accounts with Tīmūr's nominee in Hindustan.

So only three months after the Qannauj campaign Iqbāl Khan

⁴⁵ T.A., I, 259 and E and D, IV, 39 have Rai Jalhar. Ferishta, I, 160, has Rai Jhala. T.M.S., 172, has Jalbahār.

⁴⁶ Badzoni, Ranking, I, 362.

⁴⁷ T.M.S., 172-73; Ferishta, I, 160. T.A., I, 259 alone says that the Rais agreed to give every year four elephants and the amount which the Rai of Gwalior used to send to the ruler of Delhi.

⁴⁸ T.M.S., 173; T.A., I, 259.

⁴⁹ T.M.S., 173; T.A., I, 259. (Was a slave brought up in the household of Firōz Shāh). Ferishta, I, 160.

⁵⁰ T.A., I, 259; Ferishta, I, 160.

⁵¹ Bayley, Gujarat, 83.

marched to Samana in June-July, 1405 (Muharram 808 H),⁶² On his arrival Bahrām Khan fled to the hills, but later ■ and at the intercession of Saiyyad Iimuddin, grandson of Saiyyad Jalāl-ul-Haqq, peace was concluded between the two on the condition that Bahrām would join hands with Iqbāl against Khizr Khan. Their joint forces proceeded towards Multan, but Iqbāl Khan, suspecting treachery on the part of Bahrām Khan Turkbachchā got him flayed alive at Talwandi⁶³ and imprisoned his other accomplices like Rai Dāūd, Rai Bhau son of Rai Bhatti, and Rai Kamāl Main. This considerably depleted Iqbāl's strength and encouraged Khizr Khan to collect his forces of Multan, Deopulpur and the Punjab,⁶⁴ and march out of Multan to meet his enemy half way. Near Ajo-dhan a battle was fought between the two on the banks of the Dahinda⁶⁵ on 12 November, 1405 (19 Jamadiul Avval 808 H).⁶⁶ As the battle raged fiercely misfortune overtook Iqbāl Khan; his horse was wounded and it got stuck in the swampy river bank.⁶⁷ When Islām Khan Lodi's men saw that Iqbāl could not extricate himself, they fell upon him from all sides and struck off his head. The severed head was presented to Khizr Khan, who sent it to Fatehpur,⁶⁸ his native town, where it was fixed up at the gate of the city.

In Delhi the news of Mallū Iqbāl's death was received with no regret. True, he had spent his life in the service of the Tughlaq throne, had tried to establish order in Delhi out of the chaos left by Tīmūr and had fought against independent rulers and zamindars

⁶² T.M.S., 173.

⁶³ T.M.S., 173; Ferishta, I, 160. Badaoni says that he went to Rūpar, 43 miles north of Ambala, on way to Ajodhan. It is certain that Iqbāl Khan went to Talwandi. No other historian mentions Rūpar.

⁶⁴ Ferishta, I, 160.

⁶⁵ Dahinda is a stream which branches off the Sutlej to the east of Ajodhan, flows South-West and joins it again about 35 miles lower down. This course of the Sutlej is shown in Rennel's map facing pp. 63 and 315. According to Abul Fazl the Sutlej bore different ■ in different parts of its course like Harhari, Dand (Dahinda) and Nurni. *Ām. Trs.*, II, 326. Rennel, *Memoir of a Map of Hindustan*. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 362-63 n. Hodivala, 397.

⁶⁶ T.M.S., 174; T.A., I, 260; Ferishta, I, 160.

⁶⁷ T.M.S., 174; Ferishta, I, 160; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 363.

⁶⁸ This Fatehpur, Lat. 29-40 N., Long. 72-10 E., lies about ■ miles N.E. of Kahrur. It is shown in Constable's Atlas, Pl. 24, EC.

to reassert the authority of the Sultanate; but in all his acts lurked his personal ambition. He had invited Sultan Mahmūd to join him, but his motives were not entirely altruistic. He was sorely disappointed when Mahmūd, whom he had brought up on the throne almost as a child, deserted him, but it was probably Iqbāl's own ambition that had made Mahmūd suspicious. Ferishta writes that when he marched against Khizr Khan (late in A. D. 1405) he had thought of adopting the royal title after finishing off the ruler of Multan.⁶⁰ What his plans were after that last and fatal campaign, one cannot tell, but the fact remains that he never adopted the royal title, ■ struck coins nor got the Khutba read in his name. Probably content with actual sovereignty, he cared little to assume its title and insignia. All the same his treatment of Sultan Mahmūd was an irremovable stigma. His campaign against Mahmūd at Qannauj and his heinous murder of Bahrām Khan must have antagonised even his confidants. His frailties brought about his downfall, but he met his death as a courageous soldier. He fought as long ■ he lived.

Mahmūd Shāh Once More

On receipt of the news of Iqbāl Khan's death, Daulat Khan, Ikhtiyār Khan and other leading nobles of the metropolis sent ■ deputation to Sultan Mahmūd at Qannauj inviting him to Delhi.⁶¹ Accordingly he arrived in the capital in December, 1405 (Jamādī al Ākhir, 808 H)⁶² and once more ascended the throne. He sent the family of Iqbāl Khan to Kol (modern Aligarh), but did not harm it in any way.⁶³ Such treatment was indeed commendable in that age. Daulat Khan and Ikhtiyāruddīn received befitting rewards; the former was appointed governor of the Doab and the latter of Firōzābād.⁶⁴ About this time Iqlīm Khan, son of Bahādur Nāhar, brought presents and tendered his submission to the Sultan.⁶⁵

Sultan Mahmūd had at last recovered control of Delhi after a

⁶⁰ Ferishta, I, 160. ■ T.M.S., 174.

⁶¹ T.M.S., 174; T.A., I, 260; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 363. Only Ferishta, I, 160, has Jamādī al Avval.

⁶² T.M.S., 175; T.A., I, 260.

⁶³ T.M.S., 175; T.A., I, 260.

⁶⁴ T.M.S., 175; T.A., I, 260.

lapse of seven years, but he had also inherited the problems of Iqbāl Khan. He was opposed by Ibrāhīm Sharqī on the east and Khizr Khan on the west, and he decided to settle scores with both. Delhi and Jaunpur had ever been suspicious and scared of each other, for the latter had come into being at the cost of the former and in spite of it. Delhi had never recognised the independence of Jaunpur, and, on the other hand, not a few Sharqī kings were keen to incorporate Delhi in their kingdom. Thus perennial conflict between the two became inevitable. Worse still, Ibrāhīm had personally insulted Mahmūd by refusing him asylum and support.

Qannauj, an appendage of the Sharqī kingdom, had been occupied by Sultan Mahmūd in A. D. 1401-2 (804 H). On the eve of his departure for Delhi he placed it in the charge of Malik Mahmūd Tarmatī. Ibrāhīm Sharqī thought it an excellent opportunity to retake Qannauj, and advanced upon it. Sultan Mahmūd was not slow to accept the challenge and in October-November, 1406 (Jamadiul Avval, 809 H)⁶⁵ he marched out to meet the king of Jaunpur. While Mahmūd's advance made Ibrāhīm think caution to be the better part of valour, Mahmūd was rightly reluctant to start the war. Therefore, as had happened on a previous occasion, their ■■■■ lay facing each other ■■■■ the two banks of the Ganga for some time and then they returned to their respective capitals.⁶⁶

Mahmūd had refrained from fighting because he had too many irons in the fire. Before marching to Qannauj, he had sent another strong force under Daulat Khan Lodi against Bairam Khan Turk-bachchā of Samana, another of Firōz Tughlaq's Turkish slaves, who now governed the place as Khizr Khan's deputy after Bahrām Khan's tragic end. This division of the royal army had weakened both the forces. While Mahmūd dared not fight Ibrāhīm, Daulat Khan fared still worse in Samana. In a battle fought on Wednesday,

⁶⁵ T.M.S., 175.

⁶⁶ Ferishta, II, 305; T.A., I, 261. T.M.S. 175 has *تودیک (تودیک) سلطان ابراهیم مقابل قنوج گذارا آب گنگ آمدہ تول کرد*

قنوج رسید سلطان ابراهیم مقابل قنوج گذارا آب گنگ آمدہ تول کرد
(At the approach of Sultan (Mahmūd) to Qannauj, Sultan Ibrāhīm (also) arrived opposite to Qannauj at the ford of the ■■■■ Ganga, and encamped.) In a foot-note the editor of the text says that ■■■■ of the MSS. even omits the word *آب* (river). There is thus ■■■■ reason to agree with Badaoni, Ranking, I, 363, that he crossed the Ganga.

22 December, 1406 (11 Rajab, 809 H)⁶⁷ at about ■ *kurohs* from Samana. Daulat Khan had come off victorious. But since Bairam Khan owed fealty to Khizr Khan, the latter on hearing of the fall of Samana marched out of Multan to the rescue of his deputy. At this, Daulat Khan's courage failed him, and as Khizr Khan approached Fatehābād, he precipitately crossed the Jumna for the Doab.⁶⁸ Not only that, his officers who had been left behind, went over to Khizr Khan.⁶⁹ The whole of the region west of the Jumna thus passed into the hands of Khizr Khan, who bestowed large chunks of territory on officers close to him.⁷⁰ Thus, owing to his hasty and impolitic plan of action, Sultan Mahmūd's prestige and power received a severe setback, and Ibrāhīm Sharqī once again made preparations to attack Delhi. He wrested Qannauj without much difficulty, and making it his headquarters spent the rainy season there making feverish preparations for seizing Delhi. His hopes were shared by many Delhi nobles who deserted Mahmūd and joined the Sharqī king at Qannauj.⁷¹ Encouraged by these desertions, Ibrāhīm marched towards Delhi in October-November, 1407 (Jamadiul Avval, 810 H)⁷², leaving Qannauj in charge of Ikhtiyār Khan, grandson of Malik Daulat Yār Khan of Kampil. On the way he captured Sambhal in Rohilkhand and then by forced marches he arrived near Delhi and encamped on the Jumna. Delhi's fall seemed a matter of moments, when suddenly the situation took a different turn. As Ibrāhīm was about to cross the Jumna, information reached him that Zafar Khan of Gujarat was marching to attack Jaunpur.⁷³ Without wasting time or thought Ibrāhīm

⁶⁷ T.M.S., 177 and Basu, 182. T.A. has 5 Rajjab but agrees in month and year, Ferishta and Badazoni have 810 and 812 H respectively.

⁶⁸ T.M.S., 177. ⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Hisār Firzā* ■ given to Qawām Khan, Samana and Sunnam were taken away from Bairam and bestowed upon Majlis-i-Ālā Zitrak Khan while Sarhind with the adjoining parganas was given to Bairam. T.M.S., 177.

⁷¹ T.M.S., 176.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 175. Malik Daulat Yār was probably the same person who had been given the title of Daulat Khan and made 'Imādul Mulk and Ariz-i-Mumālīk in the year of Mahmūd Shāh's accession. T.M.S., 156.

Kāmpil is 60 miles N.W. of Qannauj and 28 miles N.W. of Fatehgarh. District Gaz. Farrukhābād.

⁷³ Zafar Khan had first invaded Malwa to avenge the death of his friend Dilāwar Khan at the hands of his son Alp Khan, who had ascended the throne

Sharqi retreated post-haste to save Jaunpur. Learning of his retreat, Zafar Khan did not proceed further. But Sultan Mahmūd took full advantage of the situation. In April, 1408 (Zilq'ada, 810 H) he defeated and killed Malik Marhaba whom Ibrāhīm had posted at Baran and then proceeding to Sambhal recaptured it.⁷⁴

Success in the east encouraged Sultan Mahmūd to retrieve his position in the west. Daulat Khan's debacle had cost him all his territory west of Delhi. Even Hisār Firōzā was in the hands of Qawām Khan, a governor appointed by Khizr Khan. Sultan Mahmūd's ambition was justifiable, but instead of making adequate preparations to fulfil it, he only incited his enemies into action. In November-December, 1408 (Rajjab 811 H) he attacked Hisār Firōzā, and having reduced Qawām Khan to submission⁷⁵ returned to Delhi via Dhatrath.⁷⁶ This was not a great victory, but it provoked Khizr Khan into action. He marched to Fatehābād and punished all those who had joined Sultan Mahmūd. From there he sent Malik Tuhā to ravage the Doab and himself proceeded to Delhi via Rohtak and, on 1 February, 1409 (15 Ramzān, 811 H),⁷⁷ besieged Mahmūd at Sirī and Ikhtiyār Khan at Firōzābād. The fall of Delhi seemed to be a matter of days but the countryside, wasted by several years of famine, was no longer capable of supporting an army of invasion, and Khizr Khan was compelled to raise the siege due to scarcity.⁷⁸

Khizr Khan

Khizr Khan had returned without achieving anything worth the with the title of Hoshang Shāh. ■ had imprisoned Hoshang and occupied Dhar (Commissariat, I, 58). Similarly, true to his loyalty to Sultan Mahmūd to the last, Zafar Khan had planned to help him against Iqbāl Khan, and had stopped only on learning of his ■ at the hands of Khizr Khan. Now hearing that Sultan Mahmūd ■ threatened by the Sharqi king, Zafar Khan ■ bound for Jaunpur after settling scores with Hoshang Shāh. Ferishta, I, 160; Bayley, *Gujarat*, 85.

⁷⁴ T.M.S., 176; Ferishta, I, 160, 161, has Malik Marziā.

⁷⁵ Ferishta, I, 161; T.A., I, 162; T.M.S., 177.

⁷⁶ T.M.S., 177, 178, has دھاترث. ■. M has دھاترث T.A., De, 289 n. 2 writes. "It is difficult to make out this name". Badaoni has دھاترث which Col. Ranking translates ■ the village of Rata. Another MS. of Badaoni has Rana.

⁷⁷ T.M.S., 178 has بازدم. Basu has obviously read it as بازدم.

⁷⁸ T.M.S., 178; Ferishta, I, 161.

name, but he had made a correct appraisal of the situation. He clearly saw the precarious position of Sultan Mahmūd and was convinced that one day he would be able to defeat him and occupy Delhi. So from now onwards he made persistent efforts towards that end. In A. D. 1409-10 (812 H) he attacked Bairam Khan Turkbachchā, who had gone over to Daulat Khan Lodi, and compelled him to allegiance. Next year he marched to Rohtak,⁷⁹ and although its governor Malik Idrīs held out for full six months without any reinforcements from Delhi, he was forced into submission.

Even when the intentions of Khizr Khan were now no longer a secret, Sultan Mahmūd was more complacent than ever. Yahyā makes a pointed reference to the fact that after the Sultan's investment by Khizr Khan in 1409 "Mahmūd remained in Delhi and undertook no further incursions". Only once did he go out to Katehar, but that too just for hunting, and kept himself busy in "amusement and merry-making".⁸⁰

Meanwhile in A. D. 1411-12 (814 H) Khizr Khan once again marched to Rohtak. Malik Idrīs and his brother Mubārīz Khan were "admitted to the honour of kissing his feet".⁸¹ He ravaged Narnaul,⁸² which was in the hands of Iqlim Khan, son of Bahādur Nāhar, and proceeding further into Mewat,⁸³ he sacked Tijārā,⁸⁴

⁷⁹ 42 miles N.W. of Delhi. ⁸⁰ T.M.S., 178-79.

⁸¹ T.M.S., 179. Also *Ferishta*, I, 161.

⁸² Narnaul is now a railway station lying S.W. of Rewari on the Delhi-Ajmer line. It is situated in 28° 2' N., 76° 14' E.

⁸³ Mewat is so called after the Meos, of obscure origin, claiming descent from Rajputs. According to some Mewat is the Sanskrit *Mēd-Vatī*, rich in fish, while some others derive Meo from Maheś, a word used in driving cattle. The original Meos probably converted to Islam during the time of Mahmūd of Ghazni. Throughout the Sultanate period the Meos harassed the kings of Delhi and vice versa right up to the coming of Bābar. During Timur's invasion, Bahādur Nāhar founded a sub-division of the Mewatis called Khan-Zadas, members of which ruled Mewat for many years. Mewat lay south of Delhi and in Mughal times formed part of the Subā of Agra. Its most famous towns were Narnaul, Alwar, Tijārā and Rewari. Today the region comprises of the districts of Mathura and Gurgaon, a considerable portion of Alwar and some of Bharatpur. See Tieffenthaler, III, map where the province is marked; Hunter, *Imp. Gaz.*, 4, 8, ff; Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 365 n; Basu's *Trs. of T.M.S.*, 184 n; 209-10 n; *Imp. Gaz. U.P.*, I, 223.

⁸⁴ Tijārā lies about 30 miles N.E. of Alwar. I.G., XXIII, 358. It is shown in Constable, Pl. 27 Cb. Bābar describes it as a stronghold of the Mewatis,

Sarabha and Kharol.⁸⁸ Ikhtiyār Khan, the governor of Firōzābād, deserted to Khizr Khan, who thus gained possession of the Doab and the environs of Delhi.⁸⁹ He once again besieged Sultan Mahmūd at Sirī. But the city was not yet destined to fall. Scarcity of provisions once again compelled him to raise the siege, and he returned to Fatehpur via Panipat⁹⁰ in April-May, 1412 (Muharram, 815 H).

Six months after Sultan Mahmūd died a natural death at Kaithal in October, 1412 (Rajjab, 815 H).⁹¹ He had ruled for a little more than eighteen years. All chroniclers, without a single exception, mistakenly write that he ruled for twenty years and two months. Obviously the error of one seems to have been copied by the others.⁹² Inclined to a life of pleasure and ease and neglectful of the affairs of the state, Mahmūd had ruled all these years only in name.⁹³ The ruler of Jaunpur did not respect him; Iqbāl Khan, who had first invited him to Delhi, developed a contempt for him for his "treachery". The turmoils of his times would have proved too much even for a capable ruler; Mahmūd simply could not face them. His stars however did him one good turn. In the end he could reoccupy the throne; and he died as the Sultan of Delhi if he had not quite lived as one. With his death the house of Tughlaq ceased to exist.

On Mahmūd's death the nobles paid homage to Daulat Khan. Although he had no claims to the throne, yet the nobility of Delhi could not just think of offering the crown to Khizr Khan, the hated "nominee" of the "accursed" Timūr. Daulat was aware of his precarious position and the strength of Khizr Khan. So, to begin with, he only concentrated on securing as many allies as possible. He succeeded in obtaining the fealty of Rai Vira Singh of Katchār and the support of Mahābat Khan of Badaon.⁹⁴ Even Malik Idris B.N. (B), II, 578. Tijārā is well-known for its security because of the strength of the ■■■■ surrounding it. Powlett, *Gaz. of Alwar*, 132.

⁸⁸ Sarabha is four miles east of Tijārā. Kharol is Gahrol, now a ruined town.

⁸⁹ T.M.S., 179.

⁹⁰ Panipat lies 53 miles north of Delhi, Lat. 29° 23' N., Long. 71° 1' E.

⁹¹ T.M.S., 180.

⁹² Including Sir Wolseley Haig in C.H.I., III, 192. Mahmūd had come to the throne in Jamadiul Avval 796 H, March, A.D. 1394 (T.M.S., 159) and died in Rajjab 815 H, October, A.D. 1412 (T.M.S., 180). Thus he reigned only for eighteen and a half years.

⁹³ Ferishta, I, 161; T.M.S., 179; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 366.

⁹⁴ T.M.S., 180; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 373.

and Mubārīz Khan, who had submitted to Khizr Khan, were induced to come over to his side. But his enemies were stronger than his few friends, and when Ibrāhīm Sharqī besieged Qādir Khan, son of Mahmūd Khan, at Kalpi,⁹² Daulat Khan avoided fighting him. Meanwhile Khizr Khan started on a full-scale invasion of Delhi. He sent a strong force to besiege Rohtak and himself marched to Mewat where he received the submission of Iqlīm Khan's nephew Jalāl Khan. Thence he marched across the Doab and sacked Sambhal. He arrived in Delhi in March, 1414, with 60,000 horse,⁹³ and invested Sirī.⁹⁴ Daulat Khan withstood the siege for full four months and surrendered only when some officers led by Malik Lona⁹⁵ treacherously admitted the besiegers. Daulat Khan was taken prisoner, confined in the Hisār Fīrōzā and later killed.⁹⁶

Thus did the Sultanate of Delhi finally pass into the hands of Khizr Khan Saiyyad on Monday, 4 June, A. H. 1414 (15 Rabiul Avval, 817 H).⁹⁷

The Sultanate vis-a-vis Other States

In the bid for the throne Iqbāl Khan, Nāsiruddīn Nusrat, Nāsiruddīn Mahmūd, Daulat Khan, the Sharqī king and Khizr Khan had

■ Ferishta, I, 161. Qādir Khan has been mentioned ■ the son of Sultan Mahmūd Khan by chroniclers like Badaonī and Ferishta. This was not the Sultan Mahmūd of Delhi but Nāsiruddīn Mahmūd Khan, son of Malikrādā Fīrōz, son of Malik Tājuddīn Turk who is said to have held the Shiqq of Mahoba and Kalpi. See Hodivala, 400.

For the history of Mahmūd Khan see Hodivala in the Numismatic Supplement No. XLII to the J.A.S.B., 1930. Also Thomas, *Chronicles*, 325-26.

⁹² Ferishta, I, 161.

⁹³ T.M.S., 181.

⁹⁴ T.M.S., 181.

⁹⁵ Badaonī, Ranking, I, 375.

⁹⁶ T.M.S., 181, has *ابن واقعه در ماه ربيع الاول*.... (i.e. this event took place in the month of Rabiul Avval). In a foot-note of the translation (p. 186) Basu remarks that MS. M-BM reads *در هفتم ماه ربيع الاول* (On the 7th of the month of Rabiul Avval). JNS has *ماه در هفتم* (17th of the month). In E and D, IV, 45, the date is ■ Rabiul Avval while ■ Ferishta, I, 161, it is 15th.

At another place Yabyā (T.M.S., 183) says that Khizr Khan took Sirī on 15 Rabiul Avval. This date is agreed upon by Nizāmuddīn (T.A., I, 265) and Ferishta (I, 161). Badaonī, Ranking, I, 375 has 17 while E and D, IV, 45, in the translation of T.M.S., has 8 Rabiul Avval.

Thomas, *Chronicles*, 326, has 7 Rabiul Avval, 817 H.

all played their game. But in the end Khizr Khan Saiyyad had emerged as the hero of the struggle. True, he had not been quite welcome for being the agent and nominee of the hated Timūr, but once he got possession of the throne the people submitted to him, for tired of the constant upheavals they wanted peace at any price. Besides, Timūr's invasion was now becoming a matter of memory.

But the Sultanate of Delhi was no longer an imperial power. It comprised only of Sindh, the Punjab and the western Uttar Pradesh. In extent it was the largest compared with the other kingdoms into which the empire had broken up, but it was not the strongest of them. Kingdoms like Jaunpur, Gujarat, Malwa, Rajasthan, Bahmanī and Vijāyanagar were equally strong if not more powerful. Some of them like Jaunpur and Malwa even tried to swallow up the Delhi Sultanate itself. Consequently, the Saiyyad rulers as well as their Lodī successors had to remain vigilant about the activities of these states. Therefore, before commencing the study of the Saiyyad rulers, it would be pertinent to make a brief study of the independent states which affected the course of the Sultanate's history from the accession of Khizr Khan to the fall of Ibrāhīm Lōdī.

These states fall into four well-defined groups. The first group comprised the Hindu states of Rajasthan of which Mewar (modern Udaipur) was the leader. The Muhammedan states of Gujarat and Malwa formed the second group. The third group lay in the south—the Bahmanī kingdom (Muhammedan) and the Vijāyanagar empire (Hindu). The fourth comprised the kingdoms of the east—Gondwānā, Orissa, Bengal and Jaunpur.

For the study of these kingdoms, the plan of Rushbrook Williams, of starting from the south, working upwards and finally concentrating on the Sultanate of Delhi, would suit best.⁸⁰ For well-nigh two centuries the empire of Vijāyanagar remained united and helped preserve the Hindu religion and culture from the onrush of the Islamic ideas and forces in the south. The Bahmanī kingdom suffered from all the weaknesses of a Muslim ruling dynasty—uncertainty of succession, intrigues of the nobles, political murders, excessive drinking, multi-marriages (with consequent over-growth

⁸⁰ *An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century*, Introduction, 6.

of population)⁹⁹ and zeal for aggressive wars against neighbouring "infidel kings". Of the eighteen rulers of the Bahmanī dynasty, five were murdered, three were removed from the throne and two died of intemperance. And towards the close of fifteenth century the kingdom had broken up into a number of small principalities—Ahmadnagar, Golkunda, Bijāpur, Bīdar and Berār. Their constant internecine wars gave the Deccan peninsula a distinct character and kept the Sultans of Delhi free from anxiety. The Bahmanī kingdom was also too close to Malwa and Gujarat, a fact which these two states could ill afford to forget. That is why whenever Gujarat, and more ■ Malwa, tried to take advantage of the Delhi-Jaunpur wars, the restraining influence of the Bahmanī kingdom did not let either of them become so powerful ■ to be tempted to attack the Sultanate of Delhi, at least never in full force.

The little kingdom of Khandāsh lay snugly in the valley of the Tapti and had little concern with the politics of the Sultanate. Similarly the vast tract of Gondwānā was not yet destined to play any important role in India's history. The little kingdom of Orissa was occasionally subjected to attacks from Bengal, Jaunpur, Malwa and Bahmanī kingdoms, but it did not affect the politics of the Sultanate in any way. The same was the case with the self-sufficient, independent and distant Bengal. But Malwa, Gujarat, Rajasthan and Jaunpur played a very important part in determining the course of events of the Sultanate of Delhi throughout the fifteenth century. Hence it would be necessary to give a brief account of the history of these kingdoms.

The kingdom of Malwa lay south-west of Delhi. It was conquered by 'Alāuddīn Khaljī in 1305 and continued to ■■■■■ a province of the Delhi Sultanate till 1401, when its governor Dilāwar Khan Ghorī, a descendant of Muhammad Ghorī, declared his independence taking advantage of the confusion created by Tīmūr's invasion. But when the fugitive Sultan, Mahmūd Tughlaq, after his cold reception in Gujarat, came to Malwa, he was received by Dilāwar with all marks of respect. Dilāwar's subservient attitude so much infuriated his son Alp Khan that he retired to Mandu. After Sultan Mahmūd's departure to Delhi (1401), Dilāwar once again became completely independent. He died ■ 1405. His son and successor

⁹⁹ Athanasius Nikitin in *Major, India in the Fifteenth Century*, 14.

Hoshang Shāh (1405-35) shifted his capital from Dhar to Mandu and adorned it with many beautiful buildings. He was involved in many wars against the neighbouring kingdoms of Gujarat, Mewar, Delhi and Jaunpur which will be referred to in their proper sequence. Suffice it here to say that having failed against the ruler of Gujarat, his western neighbour, Hoshang tried his luck against the Sultan of Delhi, but he was beaten back by Mubārak Shāh Saiyyad to whom he had to pay a handsome tribute.¹⁰⁰ However, in 1431, he was successful in wresting Kalpi from the king of Jaunpur. Hoshang Shāh was succeeded by his son Ghazni Khan, a worthless debauchee, who was murdered by his minister Mahmūd Khan, a Khalji Turk. Thus came into power the dynasty of the Khalji sultans of Malwa.

Mahmūd Khalji I (A.D. 1436-1469) was a great warrior "so that his tent became his home, and the field of battle his resting place".¹⁰¹ His long reign ■ spent in waging wars against Bahādur Shāh ■ of Gujarat, Rana Kumbhā of Mewar, Muhammad Shāh Saiyyad and Bahlūl Lodi of Delhi and Muhammad Shāh III Bahmanī. Malwa's contiguity to the Sultanate kept her very much interested in the affairs of the latter. Malwa was ambitious; she fought against Delhi and Jaunpur and carried on raids in Gondwānā and Orissa (1422). In 1440 Mahmūd Khalji marched against Muhammad Saiyyad of Delhi, but Bahlūl Lodi successfully resisted his advance. All the same he conquered lands up to Kalpi (in 1445) and compelled the Auhadī ruler of Bayana (in the Delhi Sultanate) to read the Khutba in his name (1446).¹⁰² About the time of the end of the Saiyyad dynasty, Malwa had extended its rule up to Kalpi in Bundēlkhand and its ruler was being considered by the Delhi nobles as a possible candidate for the Delhi throne. Even Bahlūl Lodi sought his help against the Sharqī king Husain Shāh (1468). But as years passed, Malwa lost in strength chiefly because of its failure against Gujarat and Mewar, ■ much so that during Sikandar Lodi's reign it was destined to lose Ranthambhor,

¹⁰⁰ T.M.S., 209-10.

■ Ferishta, Urdu trs., II, 379 ff.

¹⁰¹ In 1465 he received ■ robe of honour and patent of sovereignty from Al Mustanjid Billāh Yūsuf, the Abbaside Caliph of Egypt, but the more important recognition of his sovereignty came from Timūr's great-grandson Abū Sa'īd who exchanged envoys with him.

Narwar, Chanderi, Bayana and Kalpi to the Sultanate of Delhi.

Mahmūd Khaljī I died in 1469 after a long reign of thirty-four years. He was succeeded by two slothful monarchs—Ghayāsuddīn (1469-1500) and his son Nāsīruddīn (1500-10)—whose main occupation was the administration of their harems. The latter was succeeded by his son Mahmūd II in 1510, but only after a long civil war in which Sikandar Lodī gained many districts of the Malwa kingdom. By this time the power of Mewar and Gujarat was in the ascendant. In Malwa the nobles were fishing in the waters troubled by the civil war. To curb the power of his intriguing nobles Mahmūd II appointed as his Prime Minister, Medinī Rai (Purbīyā), a Rajput chief of a small district in eastern Malwa but well known for his valour. Medinī Rai soon acquired supreme power in the state by filling offices of responsibility with his own trusted lieutenants. At this the sultan grew suspicious of his powerful but loyal minister, and he called in the aid of Muzaffar Shāh Gujarātī to expel him. But Medinī Rai with the aid of Sangrām Singh of Mewar inflicted a crushing defeat on his sovereign in 1519. Mahmūd was captured and carried away to Chittor by Rana Sangā who was in a position to annex Malwa, but he released and reinstated Mahmūd after the right royal Rajput fashion.¹⁰³

Thus when Bābur invaded Hindustan, Medinī Rai was all powerful in Mandu; his officers held Gagraun and Chanderi and his brother Silāhī ruled in Raisēn, Vidisha (Bhilsa) and Sārangpur.

To the west of Malwa was situated the kingdom of Gujarat. Its immense wealth, due particularly to its commercial and maritime activity, had tempted many invaders to attack it. Mahmūd of Ghazni had carried away immense wealth from Somnath, and Muhammad Ghori had invaded it in 1196. 'Alāuddīn Khaljī had annexed Gujarat to the Empire of Delhi in 1299, but during the confusion created by Timūr's invasion Zafar Khan, a convert from

— However, such magnanimity was wanting in Bahādur Shāh II of Gujarat who, incensed with Mahmūd for sheltering his rebel brother, attacked and killed Mahmūd and annexed his kingdom in March, 1531. Malwa continued to be a part of Gujarat till 1535 when the Mughal Emperor Humayūn defeated Bahādur Shāh. — Shāh Suri appointed Shujā'at Khan as the governor of Malwa. Shujā'at's son was Bāz Bahadur, whose passionate love for princess Rūpmati of Sārangpur has immortalised his — in Malwī folklore and legend.

the Tauk¹⁰⁴ clan of the Rajputs, assumed independence in 1401. After the death of his rebel ■ Tātār Khan, he assumed the title of Sultan Muzaffar Shāh. He waged a successful war against Sultan Hosbang of Malwa and captured Dhar, but four years later he was poisoned by his grandson Ahmad Shāh in June, A.D. 1411.

Ahmad Shāh ruled for thirty years. During this period, he waged wars and extended his dominions. He administered the country with courage and sagacity and propagated the Islamic faith to which the house had been converted only three generations ago. He shifted his capital to Karnawati, renamed it Ahmadābād,¹⁰⁵ and adorned ■ with forts, mosques, gates, tombs and other beautiful buildings. Besides, success always attended Ahmad's campaigns against the rulers of Malwa and other neighbouring princes like those of Idar, Champanēr, Dūngarpur and Mewar. His only defect (not in the eyes of Muslim chroniclers) was that he was a bigoted ruler. He died in A.D. 1442.

Ahmad Shāh's successor was his eldest son. He reigned till 1451, the year in which Bahlūl Lodī ascended the throne of Delhi. After two other weak rulers came to the throne in 1459, Sultan Mahmūd, commonly known as Mahmūd Beghārā, by far the greatest of the Gujarat kings. A contemporary of both Bahlūl and Sikandar Lodī, he is lavishly praised by the author of *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī* for his generosity, gallantry and love of justice.¹⁰⁶ Ascending the throne at a young age, he ruled with success over the destinies of Gujarat for fifty-three years (1459-1511) full of military glory. In A.D. 1461-62 he helped Nizām Shāh Bahmanī against an attack from Mahmūd Khaljī of Malwa. He captured Pardi near Daman in 1464; in 1467 he attacked Jūnāgarh and annexed Surat to his dominions. The Raja of Gīmar was compelled to surrender in 1470, and in 1472 Beghārā established his influence in Sindh by rendering help to Jām Nizāmuddīn. Next year he invaded Kutch and Dwārakā and severely punished the pirates of Jagat (Dwārakā). Champanir was attacked in 1482. As a result of Mahmūd Beghārā's conquests the

¹⁰⁴ For Tauk ■ Tak clan see Elliot, *Races of the N. W. Province*, Beames' edition, I, 109, ■4; Cunningham, Arch. Sur. Rep., II, ■. Tod, *Annals*, Madras edition, I, 103 ff.

¹⁰⁵ Haveli, *Aryan Rule in India*, 314.

¹⁰⁶ Bayley, *Local Muhammadan Dynasties, Gujarat*, 161.

kingdom of Gujarat extended from the frontiers of Malwa in the east to the frontiers of Sindh on the west. In the north it extended up to the frontiers of Nagor, Jalor and Kumbalgarh and in the south-east up to Khandēsh. On the side of the sea it extended as far as the bounds of Chaul, south of Bombay.

From 1500 onwards Mahmūd was busy in wars against Malwa and Khandēsh. His achievements were so great that in 1510 he received congratulations from Sikandar Lodī for his success in Khandēsh. Towards the end of his reign Mahmūd had to engage in war with the Portuguese who had established a lucrative trade in Gujarat ports like Cambay and Chaul since the discovery of the Cape route by Vasco da Gama in 1498. This had adversely affected the interests of Indian merchants. To do away with the Portuguese monopoly of the spice trade, Mahmūd Beghārā entered into an alliance with Qansu Ghorī, the Sultan of Egypt. The Egyptian fleet under the command of Amīr Hussain and the Indian contingent under the command of Malik Ayāz attacked and defeated a Portuguese squadron commanded by Don Lorenzo, son of the Portuguese Viceroy, Francisco de Almeida, near Chaul in A.D. 1508. But next year the tables were turned and Mahmūd had to grant the Portuguese a site for a factory at Diu. Thereafter, the influence and strength of foreigners on the west coast went on growing apace.

In 1511 Mahmūd Beghārā was succeeded by his son Muzaffar Shāh II. In attempting to prevent Malwa from falling entirely under Hindu domination, Muzaffar became involved in a disastrous war with Mewar. He was successful in getting Mahmūd Khaljī II of Malwa reinstated on his throne (1519), but at the cost of Gujarat's stability and strength, because in the same year Rana Sangrām Singh occupied Idar, plundered Ahmadnagar and marched on Vadnagar. In 1521-22 Muzaffar retaliated by storming many Rajput strongholds and the Rana offered terms of peace. But in 1524 Muzaffar's son Bhādur, claiming but not getting equality with the heir-apparent, fled to Ibrāhīm Lodī at Delhi. Thus the politics of Gujarat was in a melting pot when Bābur arrived in India.

Of these three kingdoms of Gujarat, Malwa and Khandēsh, Gujarat was the richest and the strongest. Its chief interests lay in subjugating neighbouring kingdoms and constructing magnificent buildings. It ever kept busy with its immediate neighbours—

Malwa, Mewar and the Portuguese. It was geographically cut off from the Sultanate of Delhi by Malwa and Rajasthan; besides its rulers did not look at Delhi with an evil eye. Consequently the Sultanate stood in no fear from her. On the other hand its strength exercised a restraining influence on Malwa and Mewar from attacking Delhi.

Rajasthan had the misfortune of being flanked by Malwa — the south-east and Gujarat on the south-west, and it was Hindu. Therefore, it — hard-pressed by both its neighbours during the first half of the fifteenth century. Gujarat was becoming the champion of Islam in the west, and many principalities of Rajputana, including Mewar, had many times to purchase peace from Gujarat. But Rajputana too was stirred by the spirit of revival on the decline of the Sultanate of Delhi. The leader of this revivalist urge was the Guhila principality of Mewar, with capital at Chittor. Early in the fourteenth century 'Alāuddīn Khaljī had attacked and occupied Chittor, but Hammīr, Rana of Sesoda who reoccupied it in 1321, soon became master of the whole of Mewar and assumed the title of Mahārāṇā.¹⁹⁷ Hammīr died full of years in 1364 "leaving a name still honoured in Mewar as one of the wisest and most gallant of her princes", but his death was followed by years of family feuds and political assassinations. At last in A.D. 1433 ascended to the throne Rana Kumbha, one of the most famous rulers of Rajasthan. He was a great warrior, a poet, musician, man of letters and a mighty builder to whom Mewar owes some of her finest monuments. He won many victories against neighbouring Rajput princes. He also held his own against the war-like rulers of Malwa and Gujarat. In 1455 he defeated the Malwa king and to commemorate his victory he erected at Chittor the famous *Jayastambha* (Tower of Victory) also known — *Kīrtistambha* (Tower of Fame).¹⁹⁸ Out of the eighty-four fortresses built for the defence of Mewar, thirty-two were erected by Rana Kumbha. Kumbhalgarh, the fort — called after him, is a stupendous work. Curiously enough he was murdered by

¹⁹⁷ K. S. Lal, *History of the Khaljīs*, 130-31.

— Rushbrook Williams says that Mahmūd — "ignominiously defeated and captured". *An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century*, 21. Also Lane-poole, *Medieval India*, 174. Similar is the conclusion of Tod, *Annals*, I, 334-35. — Bilas Sarda, *Maharana Kumbha*, 27-28. Arch. Sur. Rep., XXIII, 211, *The Delhi Sultanate*, 179: 336.

his ■■■ Udaya in the same year in which his arch-enemy Mahmūd Khalji of Malwa died, 1469. This heinous crime disqualified Udaya Karan in the eyes of the nobles who acknowledged his younger brother Rai Mal as the ruler of Mewar. Rai Mal was a warlike prince and constantly harried the frontiers of Malwa now ruled by the slothful Ghayāsuddīn. But his reign was disturbed by the far-famed feuds of his three knightly sons—Sangrām Singh, Prithvirāj and Jai Mal. At length on Rai Mal's death his eldest son Sangrām Singh succeeded to the throne ■ 1509.

The princes of Marwar and Amber paid him homage, chiefs of Būndī, Gāgraun, Rampura and Abu served him ■ tributaries, and the rulers of Gwalior, Ajmer, Sikri, Raisēn, Katehar and Chanderi held him in the highest esteem. He fought successfully against Delhi, Malwa and Gujarat. Eighteen pitched battles did he gain against Delhi and Malwa alone. He bore the scars of eighty wounds on his body in addition to having an eye blinded and a leg maimed. Shaikh Zain afterwards wrote thus about him: "There was not a single ruler . . . in Delhi, Gujarat and Mandu, who was able to make head against him. The banner of the infidel flaunted over two hundred cities inhabited by the people of the faith". According to *Mahārānā Yash Prakasa* of Bhūr Singh, Rana Sāngā had "chained the feet" of three Sultans. Ibrāhīm Lodī could not advance from the east nor Muzaffar Shāh from the west, and Mahmūd Shāh of Malwa could not move from the south.¹⁰ He even hoped to establish Rajput sway over the whole of Hindustan at the break-up of the Delhi Sultanate.

But of all the independent states, Jaunpur, with its capital of the same name situated on the river Gomti thirty-four miles north-west of Varanasi, was the most inimical to the Sultanate. Khwājā Jahān Sarwar, the Vazīr of the last Tughlaq king Mahmūd, was sent to Jaunpur ■ 1394 with the title of Malikul Sharq to suppress the rebellious chiefs of the east. He met with such astounding success that within a short time he brought under his control the vast region stretching from Kol in the west to Tirhut in Bihar in the east, and collected tribute due to the Sultan of Delhi from the ruler of Bengal. Although he did not assume independence, yet he cut off all connections with Delhi and did not send any help to

■ Bhūr Singh, 65, cited in H.B. Sarda, *Maharana Sangā*.

Sultan Mahmūd at the time of Timūr's invasion. At his death in 1399 his adopted son Qaranfūl took the regal title of Mubārak Shāh, and issued coins in his own name.

In 1401 came to the throne of Jaunpur, Sultan Shamsuddin Ibrāhīm Sharqī. Soon after his accession he was faced with an invasion by Mallū Khan and Mahmūd Tughlaq. Mahmūd deserted to Ibrāhīm's camp, but being unwelcome, he avenged himself by occupying Qannauj which was a part of the Jaunpur kingdom. But after Mahmūd left for Delhi in 1405, Ibrāhīm reoccupied Qannauj. Ibrāhīm Sharqī was a patron of art and letters, and during his long reign of forty years Jaunpur attained the height of prosperity.

Ibrāhīm's son and successor Mahmūd fought against the king of Malwa, suppressed a rebellion in Chunār and marched against the kings of Bengal and Orissa and, of course, the Sultans of Delhi. In 1452 he advanced against Delhi in response to an invitation by some disgruntled nobles to oust Bahlūl Lodī from the throne. This attack touched off a long-drawn struggle of a quarter of a century between the Lodis of Delhi and the Sharqīs of Jaunpur. The last Jaunpur king, Sultan Husain, possessed the biggest army in India, and he invaded Delhi a number of times, but ultimately lost against Bahlūl Lodī in 1479 when his kingdom was annexed to the Sultanate. As we shall study about these wars in some detail in the following pages, there is no need to repeat them here. Suffice it to say that ever since its inception in 1399 up to its end in 1479, for full eighty years, Jaunpur posed the biggest problem to the Sultanate of Delhi.

Although in this brief discussion of the relations of the Sultanate with the various independent kingdoms of Hindustan events of later days have been anticipated, yet that would only help to appreciate the problems and policies of the Sultans of Delhi from the time of the first Saiyyad ruler Khizr Khan to all future kings of the Sultanate.

Chapter 4

REVENUE THROUGH BAYONET

Khizr Khan's Early Career

KHIZR KHAN WAS the son of Malikul Sharq Malik Sulaiman, an adopted son of Malik Nasirul Mulk Mardān Daulat.¹ It is claimed by contemporary and later chroniclers that Khizr Khan was a descendant of the Prophet, and hence they describe him a Saiyyad. But the story given in favour of this claim seems to be apocryphal.² It is just possible that Khizr Khan's ancestors might have originally hailed from Arabia, but no historian has been able to trace, in fact none has tried to trace, the nature of the consanguinity of Khizr Khan to the Prophet's family. It was in all probability to associate honour with him, and silence the opposition to a simple Turk's mounting the throne of Delhi. It also affords proof of the importance of heredity in the medieval polity.

Khizr Khan's career prior to his assuming the reins of government may be briefly recapitulated. Malik Mardān was governor of Multan in the time of Firōz Tughlaq. After Mardān's death the office devolved upon his son, Malik Shaikh, and on his death, on the latter's adopted brother Malik Sulaimān. When Sulaimān died, the government of Multan was conferred upon his son Malik Nasirul Mulk by Sultan Firōz Shāh.³ In the civil war which followed in the wake of Firōz Shāh's death, Nasirul Mulk threw in his lot with prince Muhammad against Abū Bakr and was awarded the title of

¹ T.M.S., 181; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 352.

² The story runs thus: Once Malik Mardān, Governor of Multan, invited Shaikh Jalāluddīn Bukhārī to his mansion. At the time of dinner Malik Sulaimān brought the ewer and basin for the saint to wash his hands. At this Shaikh Jalālī pointed out to Malik Mardān Daulat: "This lad is a Saiyyad— and it is derogatory for him to do a menial service". It was in this strange way the descent of Sulaimān is claimed to have been discovered, about which neither Malik Mardān nor any one in his court obviously knew anything. T.M.S., 181-82; T.A., I, 265. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 376. Ferishta, I, 161-62. Ferishta adds to his sources of information the *Tarikh-i-Mahmūd Shāh* also.

³ Ferishta, I, 161; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 376. T.M.S., 182.

Khizr Khan by him.⁴ Khizr Khan is next heard of when he was besieged and imprisoned by Sārang Khan ■ A.D. 1396 (798 H.) Having escaped from his bondage he took refuge with Shams Khan Auhadi of Bayana.⁵ From there he hastened to wait upon Timūr when the latter was marching on Delhi. The Amīr received him kindly and appointed him governor of Multan,⁶ Deopulpur and Lahore.⁷ After the departure of the great conqueror, he moved his pieces with calculated caution for full fifteen years till at length he secured the throne of Delhi.

Persian chroniclers ■ all praise for Khizr Khan's excellent qualities which they think to be an additional proof of his alleged high descent. He is called generous, brave, gentle, kind, humble, temperate and true to his promise.⁸ His life was pious, his manners amiable and his morals pure.⁹ Be that as it may, Khizr Khan possessed all the tact and talents of ■ medieval soldier, politician and ruler. He was worldly-wise and clung to monarchical power with jealous alertness. He was watchful of the happenings in Hindustan and struck when he found the moment ripe for an attack.

In the context of his character and antecedents, it is not at all surprising that Khizr Khan thought it discreet to associate the names of Timūr and his successor Shāh Rukh with the Delhi throne by including them in the Khutba.¹⁰ He also did not strike any coins in his own name,¹¹ and only restamped the coins of Firōz Tughlaq and his successors, after the fashion of Mallū Iqbāl Khan.¹² But

⁴ T.M.S., 147.

⁵ Both Z.N., II, 175 and M.T., E and D, III, 475 have Ahoḍan (أهون) but the person referred to is Shams Khan Auhadi who was the Amīr of Bayana from about 1396 (800 H.). Ferishta, I, 159, also has اوحدي.

⁶ Z.N., II, 175-76.

⁷ Ferishta, I, 159.

⁸ T.M.S., 182, trs. by Baru, 188.

⁹ T.A., I, 265.

¹⁰ Indeed Timūr's successors had not forgotten India. At the time of his death, Pir Muhammad Jahāngīr was present in the Punjab, obviously not just for sight-seeing. Abdur Razzaq affirms that Khizr Khan sent regular tributes to Shāh Rukh, son and successor of Timūr. So did Khizr Khan's successor Mubārak Khan. Abdur Razzaq: *Mall'ous S'adain*, cited in Hodi-vah, 400. T.M.S., 217-18.

¹¹ Although Nizāmuddīn and Ferishta say that he did strike coins in the later part of his reign. T.A., I, 265-66; Ferishta, I, 162.

¹² Thomas, *Chronicles*, 328.

that was probably because of the dearth of the precious metals for coining, so that most of the specimens available are those actually belonging to the reign of Firōz and other Tughlaq kings with dates altered on them.¹³ Besides, the Tughlaq money had established its reputation in the market and it was neither safe nor wise to replace it.

The inclusion of the names of the Timūrides, however, did not in any way compromise Khizr Khan's position as the king. His historians address him by high sounding titles. Yahyā calls him *Bandgī-i-Rāyāt-i-Ālā* (Service of the Exalted or Imperial Standard)¹⁴ and Badaonī, *Masnad-i-Ālā* (The Exalted Throne).¹⁵ Khizr Khan's name was also introduced in the Khutba, a privilege exclusively of the kings, although a year after his accession.¹⁶ In view of this to assert that the Saiyyads were not recognised as kings in India or abroad,¹⁷ would not be correct. Khizr Khan had won the Sultanate by the sword and he and his successors maintained it by the sword for full thirty-seven years.

As has been seen, Khizr Khan took possession of Delhi in June, 1414. He did not wreak any senseless vengeance on the people or order any massacres. On the contrary the inhabitants of the city who had suffered much during the last few years were given gifts, pensions and allowances.¹⁸ By degrees most of the nobles submitted to him and many of them were permitted to retain their offices, parganās and districts which they had held in the time of Sultan Mahmūd. Governmental machinery was reorganised. Malikul Sharq Malik Tuhfā was given the title of *Tājul Mulk* and the office of the

¹³ Thomas, *Chronicles*, 326, 329-30. The actual years of alteration under Khizr Khan's authority are indicated on the coins of Firōz Shāh ranging 818 to 830 H and of Muhammad Shāh from 818 to 825 H. Also Nelson Wright, *Coinage and Metrology of the Sultans of Delhi*, 186, 201, 214. Khizr's son Mubārak Shāh first issued coins in his own name only in 832 H. N. Wright, 231-3.

¹⁴ T.M.S., 181 ff.

¹⁵ T.A., I, 265 ff.; Badaonī, *Ranking*, I, 375 ff. Ferishta, however, always addresses him as "Saiyyad Khizr Khan". Ferishta, I, 162.

¹⁶ T.A., I, 266, Ferishta, I, 162. According to *Tarikh-i-Alfi* in A.D. 1415-16 (819 H) with Shāh Rukh's permission. Qureshi, *Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi*, 37.

¹⁷ R.P. Tripathi, *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, 78-79.

¹⁸ T.M.S., 183.

Vazīr. Saiyyad Sālīm¹⁹ received the *iqṭ'ā* of Sahāranpūr. Malik Abdur Rahīm, an adopted son of Malik Sulaimān, ■■■ awarded the title of 'Alāulmulk and the government of Multan and Fatehpur.²⁰ Malik Sarwar²¹ was appointed viceregent and Shahnā (magistrate) of the city. Malik Khairuddīn was appointed the Muster-Master; Malik Kālū, the keeper of the elephants and Malik Dāūd, Deputy to the Secretary (Naib Dabīr). The charge of the Doab was entrusted to Ikhtiyār Khan.²²

Struggle for Establishment of Sovereignty

With Khizr Khan's accession the Punjab, Sindh and Uttar Pradesh were reunited to the Sultanate of Delhi. But these were not quite submissive. Specially the whole of western Uttar Pradesh, accustomed to rebellion for more than ■ decade, hardly paid any revenue. It was then the granary of Hindustan, and like Iqbāl Khan, Khizr Khan decided to fight for the recognition of his authority in the western Uttar Pradesh first. In the very year of his accession²³ he sent the Vazīr, Tājul Mulk Tuhfā, against Rai Vīrama Singh (Har Singh of Chronicles) of Rohilkhand, called Katehār²⁴ after its inhabitants the Katehriya Rajputs. Crossing the Jumna near Ahār, situated between Bulandshahr and Moradabad,²⁵ and the Ganga at the ford of Pirāha,²⁶ Tājul Mulk entered Katehār, pillaged the countryside and compelled Vīrama Singh to pay taxes and tribute.²⁷ The Vazīr then proceeded to Badaon where he ob-

¹⁹ Saiyyadus S'adāt, Saiyyad Sālīm, was chief of ■ fraternity known as the Saiyyads of Bārah, whose ancestors had settled in Muzaffarnagar. In course of time they became great military leaders and served the Sultans of Delhi well. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they held many important offices in the State. T.M.S., Basu; 189n. Also Blochmann, *Āin*, II, 425 ff.

²⁰ T.M.S., 183; Ferishta, I, 162.

²¹ T.A., I, 266 and E and D, IV, 47. T.M.S., 183 has Sarūb ■ Sarūp ■ does not seem to be correct.

²² T.M.S., 183. ²³ *Ibid.*, 184.

²⁴ In the Medieval period Rohilkhand or the Bareilly division of U.P. ■ called Katehār. It was named after its inhabitants the Katehriya Rajputs, who, according to tribal traditions, ■ from Tirhut in the 13th and 14th centuries.

²⁵ Lat. 28° 27', Long. 78° 18'. ²⁶ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 377.

²⁷ T.M.S., 184, has *مصول و مال خدمتی* (i.e. taxes and tribute).

tained the submission of its ruler Mahābat Khan. From there, marching by the side of the river Rahāb, he recrossed the Ganga at the ford of Saragdwār²⁰ and entered the Farukhābād district. Turning westward, he fought the zamindars of Khor²¹ and Kāmpīl²² and then went to Saket²³ and Bādham.²⁴ His lightning march was quite impressive, for Hasan Khan, Amīr of Rapri,²⁵ and his brother Malik Hamza, readily joined him. Thus encouraged, he turned southward to Gwalior and exacted revenue and taxes from Gwalior, Seori²⁶ and Chandwār. Jalesar was wrested from the zamindar of Chandwār and handed over to the Muslims who had formerly held it.²⁷ Tājul Mulk once again turned to the east and

²⁰ The town of Saragdwār ■■■ founded by Muḥammad ■■■ Tughlaq about the year 799 H (A.D. 1338-39) when he went there to provide relief to the famine-stricken populace. Saragdwār had a ford where the Ganga was crossed. T.M.S., 184; Ishwari Prasad, *Qaraunah Turks*, I, 157-58.

²¹ T.M.S., 184. T.A., 266, has *کھروکھ* (Khorak which is now famous by the name of Shamsābād). It is situated in 27° 33' N and 79° 33' E about 8 miles east of Shamsābād.

The old town of Khor was founded about the beginning of the 13th century by a Rathor chief. To-day it is nothing more than a mound called the Kot or fort of the Khor Rajas. Some Kanyakubja Brahmans still ■■■ the old name and call themselves as "Khor kē Pandē". The modern town of Shamsābād ■■■ built upon ■■■ ruins of Khor. It lies 18 miles N.W. of Fatehgarh, and had a fort ■■■ Akbar's time. *Āin*, II, 196. District Gaz. Farukhābād, 255. Hunter, *Gaz. of India*, XII, 375.

²² Kāmpīl is a village ■■■ miles N.W. of Fatehgarh, district Farukhābād.

²³ T.M.S., 184 n, gives a number of readings of this place-name, but it is certainly Sākēt in Etah district. It lies on the direct route between Kāmpīl and Rāpri, 12 miles S.E. of Etah and 24 N.W. of Mainpuri. It ■■■ near here that Bahāul Lodī died. It is shown ■■■ Constable 27 Db.

²⁴ T.M.S., 184, has *بارم* MS. I has *بارم*. T.A. has *بادم* — Bādham or Pādham, which seems to be the correct form. Pādham is the name of an ancient village in Mainpuri district. It is situated on the road to Etah near the Ariad river, 23 miles from Mainpuri and 18 miles from Shikohābād in 27° 20' N. 78° 40' E. District Gaz. Mainpuri, 83, 146, 245-6. Some coins of satraps of Mathura (Circa A.D. 100) have been found at Pādham.

Arch. Sur. Rep., XI, 25, 38.

²⁵ The village of Rāpri, in Shikohābād Tehsil, is situated 44 miles S.W. of Mainpuri district town; 26° 58' N and 78° 36' E. It is said to have been founded by ■■■ Zorāwar Singh, also known ■■■ Rapar Sen. Hunter, *Gaz. of Ind.*, XI, 511. Situated at a bend of the Jumna, B.N. (B), II, 643, it was a Mahāl in the Sarkar of Agra in Akbar's time. *Āin*, II, 183, 194.

²⁶ T.A., I, 266 has Rabri.

²⁷ T.M.S., 184-85.

marching along the Āb-i-Siyāh or Kālī Nadī, he sacked Etawah of Rai Sumer. He then returned to Delhi.

While eulogizing the work of the Vazīr, Badaonī adds that by giving Jalesar back to the Muslims, Tājul Mulk "gave fresh currency to the Muhammadan religion".²⁶ But the situation was not so bright. The Sultanate had grown so weak indeed that local rajas and zamindars enjoyed independence undisturbed by moves from Delhi. For the Sultanate it was a struggle for survival; its star was at its nadir. The boast of Badaonī, therefore, has no foundation in so far as the present achievements of Delhi were concerned. In the far-off regions of Kashmir and Gujarat, however, Sultan Sikandar Shāh (A.D. 1394-1417) and Ahmad Shāh II (A.D. 1411-42) respectively were carrying on a policy of persecution of the Hindus.²⁷

Tājul Mulk's exploits of A.D. 1414-15 had been impressive, but they had failed to yield any permanent results. No sooner had he turned his back, than the region returned to old conditions and the chiefs and zamindars withheld payment of tribute. They had learnt the trick of bowing before a transitory storm, and then to resume their old ways. But Khizr Khan was determined on their subjugation. Unlike Iqbāl Khan he did not fight against far-off kingdoms like Jaunpur, but concentrated his attention on the region of Katehār (140 miles east of Delhi), Etawah (200 miles south-east) and Gwalior (190 miles south of Delhi) and the region within this range he decided to bring under effective control if it meant sending yearly expeditions for collecting revenue.

Accordingly, in A.D. 1416-17 (819 H.)²⁸ the Vazīr was sent with a large army to Bayana and thence to Gwalior; both had assumed independence during the decade of decline. At Bayana, Malik Karīm-ul-Mulk, brother of Shams Khan Anahādī the founder of the house, came to wait upon him and the town was spared, but Gwalior was sacked and its Rai compelled to pay the tribute. Once Tājul Mulk crossed the Jumna opposite Chandwār and taking the old route entered Katehār. He exacted tribute from Vīrama Singh, and then returned to Delhi.

While the Vazīr was busy in the south and east, Khizr Khan sent his son Mubārak Khan (Shahzādā-i-Mu'azzam) to manage the

²⁶ Badaonī, Ranking, I, 377.

²⁷ Ferishta, II, 182-185; *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī*, 29.

²⁸ T.M.S., 185.

restive elements in the west. Districts of Firōzpur and Sarhind and all the *iqṭ'ās* of Bairam Khan Turkbachchā were placed in his charge,³⁹ and Malik Sadhū Nadira⁴⁰ was appointed his deputy (*naib*). The Prince and his deputy, in co-operation with Zīrak Khan, the ruler of Samānā, brought the country to order. Mubārak Khan thereafter returned to Delhi in February, 1416 (Zilhijja). But within four months of his departure the near relatives of Bairam Khan, who could hardly bear the loss of Sarhind, sought the help of their leader Tughān Raīs and they attacked, defeated and killed Malik Nadira. At this Khizr Khan despatched Malik Dāūd and Zīrak Khan to deal with the rebels. On hearing them approach, the Turkbachchās crossed the Sutlej and retreated to the lower slopes of the Himalayas. Zīrak Khan marched in their pursuit, but the zamindars of the mountains, which are a continuance of the hills of Nagarkot,⁴¹ actively helped the Turkbachchās and after a couple of months the royalists, finding that they could hardly achieve anything much in that difficult terrain, withdrew.⁴²

The failure of Sarhind was followed by further discomforting news. In August-September, 1416 (Rajab, 819 H) Khizr Khan was informed that Sultan Ahmad Shāh of Gujarat had marched to Nagor⁴³ and had invested it.⁴⁴ The event was not without significance for Delhi, the more — because of the growing supremacy of Gujarat over Rajputana.⁴⁵ And although Ahmad Shāh had a reason for the invasion of Nagor,⁴⁶ yet Khizr Khan could not

³⁹ Which virtually meant the Eastern Punjab. Firōzpur is a district in the Punjab, — quite close to the Pakistan border. Sarhind lies between the Sutlej and the Jumna.

⁴⁰ T.M.S., 185 has *مالك سدھو نادرہ* (Malik Sadhū Nadira).

T.A., I, 267 has *سدھو نامر* (Sadhū Nāhar). Badaoni, Ranking, I, 378 has Malik Sadhū Nādir.

⁴¹ Ferishta, I, 162.

⁴² T.M.S., 186; also Badaoni, Ranking, I, 378.

⁴³ Nagor lies 75 miles N.E. of Jodhpur. It is situated in Lat. 27° 11', Long. 73° 46'.

⁴⁴ T.M.S., 186; Ferishta, I, 162-3; II, 185.

⁴⁵ Commisariat, I, 82. Bombay Gazetteer, VIII, Kathiawar, 286. Bayley, *Gujarat*, 98. Also Ferishta, II, 184.

⁴⁶ In A.D. 1414 Ahmad Shāh was confronted by a formidable palace conspiracy which aspired to place his uncle Firōz — the throne of Gujarat. The trouble was nipped in the bud and Firōz fled to Nagor, and although — was

remain a silent spectator of his movements and let the peril approach too close to the borders of his kingdom.

He at once marched towards Nagor passing through Tonk⁴⁷ and Todah⁴⁸ on the way. On this Ahmad Shāh retreated towards Dhar, the capital of Malwa. It is difficult to assert that it was Khizr Khan's approach that had made Ahmad Shāh retire, for at that very time, nearer home, the Hindu Rajas of Idar, Champaner, Jhalawar and Nagor, tired of Ahmad's religious intolerance, had formed a confederacy against him⁴⁹ which was also joined by the Muslim ruler of Malwa, ever jealous of Gujarat's ascendancy. Thus situated, Ahmad Shāh could not have safely stayed away in Rajputana. But his retreat to Gujarat almost appeared a Khizr Khan's victory. This had a sobering effect on many independent princes. Thus as Khizr Khan was returning towards Delhi, Iliyās Khan, governor of Shahr-i-Nau or Jhain,⁵⁰ made his submission. Similarly the Raja of Gwalior and Karīmūl Mulk, the brother of Shams Khan Auhadī of Bayana,⁵¹ paid taxes and tribute. In a triumphant mood Khizr Khan returned to Delhi.

Soon after the Sultan ordered Zīrak Khan to march against Tughān Rais, who had murdered Sadhū Nadira, and [] invested his successor Malik Badhan in Sarhind. On Zīrak Khan's approach the Turkbachchās raised the siege. But the royal commander chased them up to Pāil⁵² and compelled Tughān Rais to pay a

[] by its Raja there, Ahmad Shāh attacked Nagor in August, 1416. Ferishta, II, 184; *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī*, 29-30.

[] In Rajputana situated in Lat. 26° 10', Long. 75° 56'.

[] Todah is situated 63 miles S.W. of Jaipur; Lat. 26° 4', Long. 75° 39'.

⁴⁷ *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī*, 33.

⁴⁸ Jhain got its [] name of Shahr-i-Nau when Ulugh Khan took it in 1301 in 'Alauddīn Khaljī's time. *History of the Khaljīs*, [] and n.

⁴⁹ Yahya (T.M.S., 185) as well as all other chroniclers write that Shams Khan Auhadī met Khizr Khan. That is a mistake. Shams Khan was killed by Mallū Iqbāl Khan in A.D. 1401 (803 H). It was certainly Karīmūl Mulk, brother of Shams Khan, who was governing Bayana, and met Tājūl Mulk when the latter visited Bayana early that year.

⁵⁰ T.M.S., 187 has پیل (Pāil) and [] has T.A., I, 267. Other MSS. of T.M.S. (text note 3, 187) have بیل (Bāid) and بابل (Bābul). K. K. [] (T.M.S. trans., 193, n. 8) says that Pāil may safely be identified with Baila in the Dehradun district on a high mountain. Lat. 30° 45', Long. 78° 47'. But

large indemnity and send ■■■ of his ■■■ as hostage. For this act of abject subservience he was rewarded with the *iqṭ'ā* of Jalandhar.⁵³

Taking advantage of the trouble in the Punjab, Virama Singh of Katehār rose in revolt in A.D. 1418 (821 H). Tājul Mulk's punitive expeditions in the Doab-Katehār region in 1414 and 1416 had exasperated Virama into defying the authority of the Sultanate. Khizr Khan ordered Tājul Mulk to proceed against Virama, but the latter was prepared for the worst. He laid waste his own country after the time-honoured scorched-earth policy, and escaped into the forest surrounding Aonla in the Kamaon hills.⁵⁴ Unable to deal with the object of his pursuit, the Vazīr "contented himself with the ignoble but customary satisfaction of plundering the people".⁵⁵ To carry his mission further Tājul Mulk proceeded to Etawah. He crossed the Ganga at the ford of Bijlānā⁵⁶ and then besieged Etawah. Finding his countryside put to indiscriminate plunder,⁵⁷ Rai Sumēr made peace by giving tribute and rendering homage. But Tājul Mulk's devastating progress had exasperated the people of the region so that within six months Khizr Khan himself had to march out to bring to book the disaffected western Uttar Pradesh. But the more the raids the greater the resistance. Perhaps a policy of conciliation would have brought about better

he is not correct. This Pāil, now a railway station, lies 25 miles N.W. of Sarhind as the crow flies.

⁵³ Jalandhar is a place of great antiquity. It has been described by Hsien Tsang as then being ■ town two miles in circuit. It is also mentioned by Ptolemy by the name of Kulindrinepr Salindrine. See Cunningham, A. G. I. 135. Hunter, *Gaz. of Ind.*, VII, 91. Ranking, note in Badaoni, 382.

⁵⁴ T.M.S., 187; Ferishta, I, 162. Aonla is now a full-fledged town shown on modern maps, Lat. 28° 16', Long. 79° 12'.

⁵⁵ C.H.I., III, 207.

⁵⁶ T.M.S., ■■■ 414, and so have Badaoni, Ranking, I, 379, and T.A., I, 258. Ferishta, I, 162 (fourth line from bottom) alone has "he ■■■ to Badaon and crossed the Ganga." The "Bajlānā" of the chroniclers was, therefore, ■■■ Badaon and can certainly not be Bijnor as suggested by K. K. Basu, in his translation of the T.M.S., 194 n. 5.

Bajlānā is ■ misreading for Pachtana. It was a *sarāh* in Kol, Sūba Agra (Am. Tra., II, 186). It now does not lie ■ Ganga as ■■■ has changed ■ course, but on "the old Ganga" in Kaegunj Tehsil, district Etah. Elliot, *Races*, II, 97. L.G. XV, 69.

⁵⁷ Ferishta, I, 162.

results. Not only did the rulers of Gwalior, Katehār and Etawah never submit to Khizr Khan, but his policy of continuous repression turned even friends into foes. The instance of Mahābat Khan, ruler of Badaon, amply bears out this thesis.

On his punitive expedition Khizr Khan had first chastised the inhabitants of Kol (Aligarh), situated within eighty miles of the capital city, and then had scoured the region of the Rahāb and Sambhal.⁵⁸ Mahābat Khan, the governor of Badaon, who was present in the Sultan's camp, having had a foreboding that his own fief might be attacked, fled from the camp and entrenched himself in Badaon. Mahābat Khan was a nobleman of Nāsiruddin Mahmūd Shāh,⁵⁹ but after the new dynasty had come to the helm of affairs he had turned loyal to Khizr Khan and whenever Tājul Mulk had marched to Katehar Mahābat had showed him due deference. But now for no ostensible reason Khizr Khan had scared him, and when he fled for safety Khizr Khan laid siege to Badaon in January, A.D. 1419 (Zilhijja, 821 H.)⁶⁰

The investment went on for six months.⁶¹ The rebellion of such an old and trusted nobleman, who had a number of friends and supporters in the royal camp, was not easy to deal with. It was reported that Amirs and Maliks such as Qawām Khan, Ikhtiyār Khan⁶² and many officers of Mahmūd Shāh were sympathising with the rebel. To isolate them from Mahābat Khan, Khizr Khan raised the siege even when "victory was imminent".⁶³ On his way to Delhi he invited all the suspected nobles, including Qawām Khan and Ikhtiyār Khan, to a function arranged on the banks of the Ganga and there got them done to death.⁶⁴

Pseudo-Sūrang and Tughān Raīs

Interested groups were not slow to take advantage of such a state

⁵⁸ Sambhal lies 111 miles west of Moradabad.

⁵⁹ Ferishta, I, 162. ⁶⁰ T.M.S., 189.

⁶¹ T.M.S., 189; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 380; T.A., I, 268; Ferishta, I, 162-63.

⁶² Ferishta, I, 163 has Ikhtiyār Khan Lodi. ⁶³ T.M.S., 189.

⁶⁴ On 14 June, 1419 (20 Jamadiul Avval, 822 H) according to both Yahyā and Nizāmuddin. T.M.S., 189; T.A., I, 268. Only Ferishta, I, 163 has 8 Jamadiul Avval.

of affairs, and an impostor from Bajwara,⁶⁶ a dependency of Jalandhar, declared himself to be Sārang Khan.⁶⁷ It was well known that Sārang Khan had been killed during Tīmūr's invasion,⁶⁸ but many people, some foolish and ignorant while others clever and interested, joined the Pretender. It was Sārang Khan who had expelled Khizr Khan from Multan a little before Tīmūr's invasion, and his very ■■■■ must have given the Sultan a creeping feeling as well as revived bitter memories in his mind. He therefore immediately directed Malik Sultan Shāh (subsequently entitled Islam Khan),⁶⁹ belonging to a family of the Lodī clan recently domiciled in India and holding the governorship of Sarhind, to march against the impostor. In July, 1419 (Rajjab, 822 H)⁷⁰ Sultan Shāh marched with his forces from Sarhind. On the way he was joined by Zīrak Khan of Samana and Tughān Raīs of Jalandhar.⁷¹ The pseudo-Sārang together with the forces of Khwājā 'Alī Māzindrānī,⁷² the Amīr of Jāth in Sindh⁷³ who had joined him, advanced from Bajwara to Rupar to meet Sultan Shāh. The latter succeeded in inflicting a crushing defeat on the rebels, who retreated into the Simla hills. The royalists occupied Rupar, where they were joined by Malik Khairuddin who had been sent from Delhi to help quell the rebellion.⁷⁴ They combed the mountains but the Pretender succeeded in eluding them. Finding the task hopeless, the royal

⁶⁶ Yahyā and all other chroniclers except Ferishta have Bajwara. Yahyā also adds that it was a dependency of Jalandhar (T.M.S., 189). Bajwara lies 1½ miles east of Hoshiarpur and 25 miles N.E. of Jalandhar. (Hunter, *Imp. Gaz.*, II, 439).

Only Ferishta makes it Machchiwara. Machchiwara lies 23 miles south of Ludhiana on ■■■ Sulej and is said to be a very ancient city having been mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*. Ferishta is mistaken and the place of the Pretender was certainly Bajwara. Also see Ranking's note in Badaoni, I, 380; T.A., De, note 297 and Rennel's map.

⁶⁷ T.A., I, 269; Ferishta, I, 163.

⁶⁸ Ferishta, I, 163. Also E and D, IV, 51 n.

⁶⁹ T.M.S., 189; Ferishta, I, 163.

⁷⁰ T.M.S., 189; T.A., I, 269.

⁷¹ T.M.S., 190.

⁷² E and D, IV, 51, has Indarabi and Basu, translator of T.M.S., repeats the mistake. T.A., I, 269, also wrongly has اندرابی. It is clearly given in T.M.S., text, 190, as مازندرانى, i.e. Khwājā 'Alī belonging to Māzindrān.

⁷³ Jāth or Jhet may be Chāth or Chahat which was a Mahāl in the Sarkar of Sindh and lay on the Ghaggar. *Ann. Tra.* II, 296.

⁷⁴ T.M.S., 190; T.A., I, 269.

commanders returned to their respective fiefs. Khizr Khan had failed against the Pretender, but the latter soon fell a victim to the perfidy of Tughān Raīs who inveigled him into his power, not so much from any sense of loyalty to the Sultanate as for possessing the great wealth which the impostor had amassed, and later put him to death in February, 1420 (Muharram, 823 H).⁷⁴ Howsoever his fall was brought about, the death of the Pretender was Khizr Khan's gain.

Simultaneously in the east Tājul Mulk was busy collecting the annual revenue, marching through and sacking Baran (Bulandshahr), Kol (Aligarh) and Deoli, "which was a stronghold of the infidels,"⁷⁵ he arrived at Etawah. The inhabitants of the countryside were plundered and the fort invested, whereupon Rai Sumār paid the usual revenue or tribute. Chandwār was plundered next and revenue was collected from Vir Singh of Katēhar and Mahābat Khan of Badaon.

Hardly had Tājul Mulk returned from his expedition when in August, 1420 (Rajjab, 823 H) Tughān Raīs, strengthened by the treasure he had seized and afraid of some action on the part of Khizr Khan, unfurled the standard of revolt. He pillaged the tract up to Mansūrpur and Pāil⁷⁶ in the northern Punjab and then laid siege to the fort of Sarhind. Malik Khairuddin marched from Delhi via Samana, where he was joined by Zīrak Khan, to deal with the rebel. On their approach Tughān Raīs raised the siege and retreated, crossing the Sutlej in Ludhiana.⁷⁷ The royal commanders too crossed the river and inflicted on him a crushing defeat. The rebel fled to seek refuge with Jasrat Khokhar⁷⁸ and his fief of Jalandhar was bestowed upon Zīrak Khan.

Early in the year A. H. 1421 (824 H) Khizr Khan marched into Mewat, where trouble was brewing. The Kotia of its erstwhile ruler Bahādur Nāhar was taken in the first assault and thoroughly sacked. Some recalcitrant Mewatis escaped into the mountains

⁷⁴ T.M.S., 190-91.

⁷⁵ T.M.S., 191 has *موضع دهلی*. So has T.A., I, 269. This Dehlī must be Deoli-Jakhan near Etawah. Deoli lies about 10 miles N.E. of Etawah. Even now Chauhans are found there in great strength. U.P. Gaz., X, Mainpurī, 94, 131, 104; Elliot, *Races*, II, 86.

⁷⁶ T.M.S., 191.

⁷⁷ T.M.S., 192. Ferishta wrongly has Lohānā.

⁷⁸ T.M.S., 191-92.

while the others made their submission. Khizr Khan then turned towards Gwalior. During the march the loyal and veteran general Malik Tājul Mulk passed away on 13 January, 1421 (8 Muharram, 824 H).⁷⁹ He had rendered invaluable service to the Sultanate in the most trying times, and had almost killed himself with exertion in the act of bringing the recalcitrants to book. It was, therefore, in the fitness of things that Khizr Khan should bestow upon his eldest son Malik Sikandar Tuhfā the office of Vazīrat and the title of Malikul Sharq (Lord of the East) enjoyed by Tājul Mulk.

From Gwalior Khizr Khan collected the stipulated tribute and then proceeded to Etawah. Rai Sumār had died and his son Deva Rai purchased peace on the usual terms of payment of revenue or tribute. Here the monarch fell ill. In all haste he returned to Delhi, but only to breathe his last on Tuesday, 20 May, 1421 (17 Jamādiul Avval, 824 H).⁸⁰

A Resume of Khizr Khan's Work

Khizr Khan had died after a reign of seven years.⁸¹ He had learnt from the experience of Mallū Iqbāl Khan and Sultan Mahmūd that too many irons in the fire resulted in success in no quarter. Therefore, he formulated no ambitious schemes. He did not take cudgels against Jannpur or Gujarat. True he marched towards Rajputana when Gujarat threatened his position, and tried to quell insurrection in the Punjab, but otherwise he mainly concentrated on stamping out sedition within a perimeter of about 200 miles from Delhi—up to Samana in the west, Katōhar in the east, Etawah in the south-east and Bayana and Jhām in the south and south-west. He created a terrible stir in that region, and although time was needed for its complete subjugation, yet the petty and prominent chiefs of this area were ever kept reminded that they could

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁸⁰ T.M.S., 192; T.A., I, 270; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 381; Ferishta, I, 163.

His tomb lies in Okhla to the S.E. of Khizerābād. Asār, chap. II, 25-6. Carr Stephen, 159; List, IV, No. 17. J.I.H., XXXI, 1953, 211.

⁸¹ Ferishta says that he reigned for seven years and four months, while Nizāmuddīn Ahmad is accurate in saying that he reigned for seven years, two months and two days. This is according to the Lunar Calendar. According to the Solar Calendar he ruled for seven years, short by a fortnight.

live in peace only if they made their submission. Rebels in the Punjab were dealt with with a strong hand, and taxes and tributes were exacted from the Doab, Katāhar, Mewat and Gwalior regions, year after year. In the circumstances obtaining, it was no mean achievement that he had managed to keep his territories intact, if not augment them. This was mainly possible because Khizr Khan trusted his officers. He never changed their assignments. Tājul Mulk was always sent to the east, and though his success there was partial, his ■■■ of action was never transferred. Similarly Zirak Khan was left to look after the west. Experience in their respective areas added to their strength in dealing with the rebellious elements.

However, Khizr Khan's policies and achievements had certain shortcomings. The yearly collection of revenue at the point of the bayonet was not a happy affair. While it exasperated the local chiefs, the state could not be sure of ■ regular revenue, and hence its finances remained shaky. Perhaps the best proof of it is that throughout his and his dynasty's rule the coins struck are uniformly of copper, and the old silver and gold coins of India completely disappear.⁸² Moreover Khizr Khan's preoccupation in the difficult region of western Uttar Pradesh left him no time to deal with the kingdom of Jaunpur which went on growing from strength to strength under its talented monarch Ibrāhīm Sharqī. Besides, to maintain his position and to deal with the rebels of the Punjab, he had to requisition the services of Afghan leaders and men. The ascendancy of the Afghans during the reign of Khizr Khan and that of his successors, in the long run proved to be disastrous for the Saiyyad dynasty.

⁸² Pringle Kennedy, *op. cit.*, I, 85.

Chapter 5

THE PUNJAB IN TURMOIL

AFTER KHIZR KHAN'S demise his son Mubārak Khan succeeded to the throne on 22 May, 1421 (19 Jamādī al-Awwal, 824 H)¹ under the title of Mu'izzuddīn Abul Fateh Sultan Mubārak Shāh². Tīmūr was in his grave for the last fifteen years, and the terror he had inspired was now a memory of the past. Besides, Khizr Khan's ■■■■ years of struggle had succeeded to a good extent in establishing the position of the Saiyyad dynasty. Mubārak Shāh therefore felt strong enough to remove Shāh Rukh's name from the Khutba; he assumed full sovereignty, took the title of Sultan³ and issued his own coins.

Jasrat Khokhar

Mubārak Shāh inherited all the problems his father had left unsolved, and no sooner had he donned the royal robes⁴ than he was called upon to deal with Jasrat Khokhar's rebellion in the Punjab.

According to Badaonī Jasrat Khokhar was the son⁵ of Shaikha

¹ The Bib. Ind. text of T.M.S. has 17 Jamādī I, but in a footnote the editor says that the British Museum MS. has 19 جمادى or 19. Elliot's MS. too had 19 (E and D, IV, 53). Ferishta writes that Mubārak Shāh ascended the throne three days after the death of Khizr Khan during which all ■■■■ in mourning (Ferishta, I, 163). It was on 17 Jamādī I that Khizr Khan had died, and Mubārak Shāh ascended the throne on 19, the third day of the demise of the Sultan, when the period of mourning was ■■■■

² Ferishta, I, 163.

³ T.M.S., 193. T.A., I, 271 and Ferishta, I, 163.

⁴ Mubārak Shāh did not effect many changes of portfolios at the time of ■■■■. He only transferred Malik Rajjab Nādīra, ■■■■ of Malik Sadhū Nādīra, from the districts of Hissār Firōzā and Hansi to that ■■■■ Deopalspur. Hissār Firōzā and Hansi were conferred upon Malik Badr, nephew of Sadhū Nādīra. T.M.S., 193; Ferishta, I, 163.

⁵ Badaonī, I, 289 and Sharafuddin Yazdī, Z.N., II, 169 call him son of Shaikha Khokhar. Ferishta, I, 156 calls Jasrat 'brother' of Shaikha Khokhar. Yahyā in T.M.S., 193, has "Jasrat Shaikha Khokhar".

Khokhar, chief of the Khokhar tribe,⁵ and master of the countryside around Sialkot. When Amīr Timūr was marching through the Southern Punjab, on his way to Delhi, Jasrat Khokhar was courageous enough to oppose him between Tulamba and Deopulpur, but he was worsted and with great difficulty escaped to his father.⁷ Later on, taking advantage of the confusion created by Timūr's invasion, he and his father reoccupied Lahore. When Shaikha was killed by the conqueror's orders on account of his "treachery", Jasrat was carried a prisoner to Samargand. On the conqueror's death he effected his escape,⁸ returned to his homeland, resumed the leadership of his tribe and entrenched himself in the Khokhar stronghold of Sialkot.⁹ Taking advantage of the weakness of the Delhi Sultanate, he made minor additions to his independent principality whenever an opportunity presented itself. He took an active part in the Civil War in Kashmir which broke out between two royal brothers 'Alī Shāh and Shāhi Khan and gained from it immensely. It so happened that Sultan 'Alī Shāh of Kashmir, successor of Sikandar the Iconoclast, while going to pay a visit to his father-in-law, the Raja of Jammu, had

⁵ Ferishta, I, 156 ff. makes the mistake of calling Jasrat Gakkhar. The Khokhars, the Gakkhars and the Kākars — generally confounded with one another, but these — three different tribes.

The Khokhars are of indigenous origin and belong to the race of foreign invaders who — to India prior to Muslim conquest. They live on both sides of the Jhelum, from Mianwali to Jhang-Maghuana, and chiefly in the Shahpur district of the Punjab. In the fifteenth century they were in great strength in the region between — Ravi and the Chenab in northern Punjab extending up to Kashmir hill tracts. The Khokhars are split up into Muslim, Rajput and Jāt sections.

The Gakkhars, who claim a Persian origin, belong to one of the invading — of India. They live in Attock, Jhelum and Rawalpindi districts in the Punjab, Hazara district in the N.W.F. Province, and Jammu region west of the Chenab.

The Kākars are Afghans and inhabit northern Baluchistan. The Gakkhars and Kākars are Muhammedans. Ain., I, 456, 486; Gakkhars in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*; Punjab Census Report, 1887, 149; Punjab District Gazetteers on Attock, Shahpur and Rawalpindi; I.H.Q., XV, 1939, 49 n; J.A.S.B., XL, 1871, Pt. I, 67; Indian Antiquary, XXXVI, 1-8.

⁷ Z.N., II, 57, 171; M.T., E and D., III, 416; R.S., VI, 105; Ferishta, I, 159.

⁸ J.A.S.B., XL, 1871, Pt. I, 80. ⁹ Ferishta, I, 163; II, 364.

left the administration of his kingdom in the hands of his brother Shāhi Khan. When he returned after some time, Shāhi Khan refused to acknowledge him. Thereupon 'Alī Shāh with the help of the Rajas of Jammu and Rajourī defeated his brother and drove him out of Srinagar. Shāhi Khan sought the help of Jasrat Khokhar, and the two together defeated 'Alī Shāh at Thanna¹⁰ in May-June, 1420 (Jamadiul Avval, 823 H),¹¹ and Shāhi Khan ascended the throne at Srinagar as Sultan Zainul Ābidīn. Jasrat's gain too was considerable. He had seized a large booty in the recent war, besides winning the friendship of the new Kashmir king. Thus strengthened, he began to dream of the throne of Delhi.¹² Zainul Ābidīn in his gratitude actively helped Jasrat in his plans with men and money.¹³ It was about this time that Tughān Rais, after his defeat at the hands of Khizr Khan's general Zirak Khan, also joined the standard of Jasrat Khokhar.¹⁴

Khizr Khan's death provided a golden opportunity to Jasrat to raise his head, and in the very month of Mubārak Shāh's accession he descended on the Punjab like lightning. Starting from Sialkot and crossing the rivers Ravi, Beas and Sutlej, he attacked Rai Firōz Maīn,¹⁵ governor of Ludhiana, at Talwandi¹⁶ and drove

¹⁰ Mohibbul Hasan, *Kashmir Under the Sultans*, 69.

¹¹ T.M.S., 194; T.A., I, 271; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 381-82; Ferishta, I, 163.

¹² T.M.S., 193-94; Ferishta, I, 163; T.A., I, 271.

¹³ Ferishta, II, 342.

¹⁴ T.M.S., 197.

¹⁵ Yahyā followed by other chroniclers says that Kamāluddīn Maīn was attacked at Talwandi and in the next sentence writes, "Rai Firōz Zamindar of the place" fled towards the east. T.M.S., 194; Ferishta, I, 163; T.A., I, 271; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 382.

Jasrat did not attack Rai Kamāluddīn himself (for he was not alive at this time) but Talwandi of Rai Kamāluddīn, that is, Talwandi bearing his name probably because it had been founded by him. The person attacked was Rai Firōz, Kamāluddīn's son or successor. Perhaps Rai Firōz, after the custom in certain regions of India, had his name joined with that of his father. His full name therefore was Rai Firōz Kamāluddīn Maīn, as is clear from a statement a few pages later where we find Rai Kamāluddīn Firōz Maīn joining Sikandar Tuhfā at Lahore. T.M.S., 199; Ferishta, I, 164; T.A., I, 273. For a discussion on the name also see Hodivala, II, 159.

¹⁶ Talwandi is situated 20 miles S.W. of Ludhiana. It seems to be a corrupted form of village Tulum on the northern bank of the Sutlej. Rennel's map facing p. 65; also Badaoni, Ranking, I, 382 n.

him towards the east. Jasrat ravaged the country along the southern bank of the Sutlej as far as Rūpar and then recrossing the river laid siege to Jalandhar. Jalandhar had been taken by Khizr Khan from Tughān Rāis during his last rebellion and was placed in the charge of Zīrak Khan. Invested and hard pressed, Zīrak agreed to the terms offered by Jasrat Khokhar,¹⁷ but when he came out of the fort he was treacherously imprisoned by the Khokhar chief and carried off to Ludhiana. Marching from Ludhiana, Jasrat arrived at Sarhind,¹⁸ which was held by Sultan Shāh Lodī on behalf of the Sultan of Delhi. He laid siege to the fort but because of the rainy season failed to take it. This gave Sultan Shāh time to appeal to Delhi.

The appeal for succour lashed Mubārak Shāh into action, and in spite of heavy rains he left for Sarhind in July, 1421 (Rajjab, 824 H).¹⁹ As he reached Kohila²⁰ near Samana, Jasrat raised the siege of Sarhind and hurriedly fell back on Ludhiana. During this precipitate retreat Zīrak Khan contrived to escape,²¹ and joined the Sultan at Samana. Mubārak Shāh started in pursuit of the enemy, but on arrival at Ludhiana he learnt that Jasrat had crossed the Sutlej with all available boats. As the river was in spate, and all the boats had fallen into the hands of the enemy, the Sultan could not cross it. But he continued to march along the bank keeping pace with the enemy on the other side. On Tuesday, 9 October (11 Shawwāl),²² when the rains had abated, the Sultan ordered Sikandar Tuhfā, Zīrak Khan, Mahmūd Hasan and Malik Kālū to march ahead and deliver a surprise attack on the enemy. They marched throughout the night and early in the morning

¹⁷ T.M.S., 794-95.

¹⁸ T.M.S., 195. Sarhind or Fatehgarh is situated in Himachal Pradesh in 30° 38' N. and 76° 27' E. The spelling Sarhind is modern. Sarhind means Lion-Forrest, but one tradition assigns it foundation ■ Sahr Rao, a ruler of Lahore. Imp. Gaz., Punjab, II, 309.

¹⁹ T.M.S., 195.

²⁰ Kohila may be identified with modern Kot or Khol, a village 48 miles south of Ludhiana. Samana ■ 17 miles S.W. of Patiala town and about 170 miles west of Delhi.

²¹ T.M.S., 196 and Badaoni, Ranking, I, 382, say that he ■ released. Ferishta, I, 163, says that he escaped. T.A. only says that he joined the Sultan.

²² T.M.S., 196; Ferishta, I, 164.

forded the river at Rūpar. The sudden appearance of the royal contingent took Jasrat by complete surprise. While he made hurried preparations to encounter it, he found to his consternation that the Sultan himself had crossed the river unnoticed and was advancing from behind. To save himself from being sandwiched between the two royal forces, Jasrat took to flight without even making a show of resistance.²³ The royal army killed many of his men and captured his equipage. Jasrat fled to Jalandhar and then crossing the Beas, the Ravi and the Chenāb,²⁴ entered Tilhar or Talwara²⁵ situated in the lower slopes of the Kashmir highlands. Raja Bhīm of Jammu,²⁶ an old enemy of Jasrat Khokhar, led the Sultan to Talwara, "Jasrat's strongest place", which was captured and destroyed, but the rebel had escaped. Convinced of the futility of pursuing the fugitive any more, the Sultan returned to Lahore early in January, 1422 (Muharram, 825 H). This important outpost on the west had been lying in a deserted state since Tīmūr's invasion. Mubārak Shāh stayed there for a month to strengthen its defences, built a mud wall around it, renamed the city as Mubārakābād, and then leaving it in charge of Mahmūd Hasan with a garrison of 2,000 men, returned to Delhi.²⁷

Jasrat Khokhar was enraged at the sack of Talwara. He collected a large force with the help of the local zamindars, descended from his hilly retreat and stood before Lahore in May, 1422 (Jama-diul Ākhir).²⁸ Establishing his base camp near the tomb of Shaikhul Mashāikh Shaikh Husāin Zanjāni,²⁹ he twice attacked the city, but on both the occasions he was worsted by Mahmūd Hasan.

²³ T.M.S., 196; Ferishta, I, 164; T.A., I, 272.

²⁴ T.M.S., 197, has چناب but obviously Chenāb is meant. Ranking (Badaoni, I, 383) correctly translates it, "Crossed the river Chināb".

²⁵ See Appendix B.

²⁶ T.M.S., 197 has Bhīlam but T.A., I, 272 has the correct name Bhīm.

²⁷ T.M.S., 197; T.A., I, 273; Ferishta, I, 164.

²⁸ T.M.S., 197.

²⁹ T.M.S., 198; Ferishta, I, 164; Badaoni, 290; Ranking I, 383. T.A. mistakenly has Rehāni.

Shaikh Husāin Zanjāni was a man of great learning. Shaikh Mu'tauddin Chishti used to attend his lectures at Lahore, where he lies buried. Shaikh Husāin Zanjāni's tomb is visited by a large number of people every year. Zanjān or Zinjān lies on the borders of Azarbaijān near Qazwin. Jarret, *Ann.*, Trs., III, 362 and notes.

Finding his position none the better, Jasrat retired to Kalanaur.³⁰ On hearing of Jasrat's activities Mubarak Shāh had ordered Raja of Jammu to intercept him and had despatched Malik Sikandar Tuhfā to Lahore to help in its defence. Raja Bhīm fought Jasrat at Kalanaur and drove him towards the Beas (August-September, 1422). Meanwhile, Malik Sikandar, marching towards Lahore, forded the Beas at Būhi³¹ and drove Jasrat across the Beas and the Ravi back into the hills of Talwara.³² Arriving in Lahore in 825 H Sikandar Tuhfā in company with Malik Rajjab Nādira governor of Deopapur, Malik Sultan Shāh Lodī governor of Sarhind, Rai Firōz Main and Raja Bhīm combed the Talwara hills, but Jasrat again eluded their grasp. Thinking further pursuit in that difficult terrain to be fruitless, the royal nobles returned to Lahore.

After ordering the aforementioned commanders to deal with Jasrat Khokhar, Mubarak Shāh marched to Katāshar to bring order in that problem tract. The details of his campaign would be studied later, suffice it here to say that the failure of the royal generals in the Punjab and the preoccupation of Mubarak Shāh in Katāshar encouraged Jasrat to attack Rai Bhīm at Jammu in April, 1423, ravage his country and kill him in battle. Large quantities of arms and treasures of the Raja fell into his hands, which added to his strength and ambition. With ten to twelve thousand foot and horse he sacked the districts of Deopapur and Lahore, but could achieve little because of the timely action of Malik Sikandar Tuhfā, the newly appointed governor of Lahore. Unable to make much headway against the Delhi armies all by himself, Jasrat invited Amīr Shaikh 'Alī³³ of Kabul to help him in fighting the

³⁰ Kalanaur is situated 17 miles west of Gurdaspur town. Akbar received the news of Humayūn's death here only, and ascended the throne at Kalanaur before marching to Agra, 1556.

³¹ T.M.S., 199 and later on p. 230 has بوهی. Badaoni I, 297 has بوهی. Ferishta has لوهی. I, 164, l. 12. E and D, IV, 77 also has Pōhi. According to Ranking "Pōhi in the text is probably identical with Pōni". Badaoni, Ranking, I, 384 n; also Hodivala, II, 16x.

³² T.M.S., 199.

³³ Shaikh 'Alī was the son of Danishmandchā, a descendant of Chaghtai, son of Chingiz. He was Naib or Deputy-governor of Kabul first under Suyurgtimish Mirza, son of Shāhrukh and later under Suyurgtimish's son Mūsā'ad

Sultanate. Luckily the latter was unable to come at that moment to Hindustan and the danger disappeared — quickly — it had dawned.

Unable to secure any help from abroad, Jasrat Khokhar kept comparatively quiet for the next five years. Now and then he would raise his head, especially whenever he found the Sultan busy in some region far away from the Punjab, but this plan did not help him much. In A. D. 1427, taking advantage of the preoccupation of the royal armies in Bayana and Mewāt, he laid siege to Kalanaur. The Sultan deputed Zīrak Khan and Islam Khan to march against him, but even before their arrival he was chased out of Kalanaur and later defeated at Kangra by Sikandar Tuhfā and his deputy Ghālib Khan. Jasrat was convinced that he could not fight against the royal armies all alone; so he waited to join hands with any other adventurer. The opportunity did not come soon, but when it came in 1431-2, he once again threw himself into the whirlpool of rebellion.

Faulād Turkbachchā and Shaiḥ 'Alī

During the few years of respite — the score of Jasrat Khokhar in the Punjab, Mubārak Shāh undertook campaigns in the central and eastern regions against independent chiefs and rulers. In the winter of 1429, while he was marching against Bayana, Gwalior, Hatkanth and Rapri on 'usual revenue-collecting expeditions, Saiyyad Sālim, the governor of Bhatinda, was taken ill and breathed his last.²⁴ He had served the Sultanate with fidelity for the last thirty years, and had held several parganās in the Doab, the Khittā of Sīrsutī, the *iqṭ'ā* of Amrohā and the fort of Tabarhinda (Bhatindā).²⁵ Though a loyal noble, Saiyyad Sālim was a man both greedy and stingy by nature. He had amassed a large amount

Mirza Kabuli. B.N. (B), I, 382; E and D, IV, 59 n. and 233. Also Brown, *Trs. of Tarīkh-i-Guṣāida*, II, 134.

Yahyā probably did not know the name of Masa'ūd Mirza and calls him only "the son of Saratamish". T.M.S., 201 and —.

²⁴ T.M.S.; Badaoni, I, 294; T.A., I, 280 C.H.I., III, writes that he died at Bhatinda.

²⁵ T.M.S., 214. Sīrsutī — Sirsa is a district in Hisar Division, Punjab, between the rivers Sutlej and Ghagar. Amroha is — Moradabad district.

of wealth and had treasured it in the fort of Bhatindā. At the time of his death his sons were in the royal camp, but his slave Faulād Turkbachchā,³⁵ who was in charge of Bhatindā, raised ■ insurrection in July, 1430 (Shawwāl, 833 H)³⁷ and confiscated the treasure.

On receipt of the news of Faulād's insurrection, Mubārak Shāh imprisoned the sons of Saiyyad Sālim, who were with him in the camp,³⁸ and sent Malik Yūsuf, son of Sarwarul Mulk,³⁹ and Rai Hansū (Hansrāj) Bhatti⁴⁰ to deal with the rebel and seize the treasure. But Faulād proved too clever for them and while posing to negotiate for a settlement, he threw them off their guard, attacked and completely routed them. They fled towards Sirsutī, pursued by Faulād, who captured all their cash, goods and tents. At this Mubārak Shāh himself proceeded to Sirsutī, and also sent word to Imādul Mulk at Multan to join him. In the meantime Zīrak Khan, Malik Kalū, Islām Khan and Kamāl Khan, who had been ordered to march and besiege Bhatinda, had begun the investment of the fort. Hard pressed, Faulād had an interview with Imādul

³⁵ T.M.S., 215 and H. has Paulād. T.A., I, 280 and Ferishta, I, 166, have Faulād. Both the words mean steel. I ■ inclined to accept Ferishta's reading.

³⁷ Ferishta, I, 166.

³⁸ At the time of the rebellion, it ■ suspected that the sons of Saiyyad Sālim had a hand in it, and ■ imprisoned them. Ferishta, I, 166; T.M.S., 215; T.A., De, 312 n. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 388.

But subsequent events show that they had little to do with Faulād's insurrection. Neither Mubārak Shāh nor ■ successors ever tried to victimise them. On the contrary, after Faulād's fall, they were enrolled in the order of nobility. In the promotion list of the time of Muhammad Shāh's accession [A.D. 1434], we find the eldest son of Saiyyad Sālim retaining the title of Majlis-i-Āl Saiyyid Khan and ■ younger one of Shujaul Mulk. T.M.S., 243. T.A., I, 290.

³⁹ T.M.S., 215 has "Malik Yūsuf Sarūp." Later on on p. ■ he is called Malik Yūsuf-i-Sarwarul Mulk. Yūsuf was the son of Sarwarul Mulk and had been appointed governor of Delhi city when his father was raised to the dignity of Vazīr. Badaoni also reads Yūsuf-i-Sarwar, Text I, 294, Ranking, I, 388. But Yahyā has Sarūp on many pages, which perhaps indicates that he may have been only recently converted.

⁴⁰ Rai Hansū, probably short of Hansrāj, was the ■ of Rai Daljit Bhatti. Both Yahyā and Badaoni call him Hansū, but at certain places he is written as Himū also.

Mulk and agreed to make his submission to the Sultan, but ■ rumour current in the camp that the Sultan meant to put him to death ■ scared him that he broke off the negotiations. But Mubārak Shāh did not want to force the issue probably because he had got an inkling that the rebel, who was in possession of an immense treasure, was trying to purchase help from beyond the Indus. To gain time Mubārak Shāh ordered Imādul Mulk back to Multan and leaving Islām Khān, Kamāl Khan and Rai Firōz Main to carry on the investment, himself returned to Delhi in November, 1430 (Safar, 834 H).⁴¹

The fears of the Sultan turned out to be true. Driven to bay, Faulād sent emissaries to Shaikh 'Alī, the governor of Kabul, soliciting his help against ready money. Greatly tempted, Shaikh 'Alī marched with a large army from Kabul to help Faulād, and in the month of February-March, 1431 (Jamadiul Akhir, 834 H)⁴² he arrived on the banks of the Jhelum. A'inuddīn, a Khokhar chief, joined him from Tilwara (this Tilwara is situated opposite Deopapur) and Shaikh 'Alī's nephew Amīr Muzaffar⁴³ arrived with ■ large contingent from Shorkot (Seor).⁴⁴ Passing through Qasūr, Shaikh 'Alī crossed the Beas at the ford of Bāhī and ravaged the country of Rai Firōz who rushed to it from the siege of Bhatinda. Shaikh 'Alī took particular care to ravage the districts of those nobles who were investing the fort of Bhatinda⁴⁵ with ■ view to unnerving them. He succeeded in his tactics, because before he arrived within twenty miles of Bhatinda, the royal commanders had raised the siege. Faulād emerged from the fort, paid Shaikh 'Alī the stipulated amount of two lac silver *tankas*⁴⁶ for his assistance and then busied himself in preparations for a stronger defence.⁴⁷

⁴¹ T.M.S., 216; T.A., I, 281; Ferishta, I, 167.

⁴² T.M.S., 217.

⁴³ T.M.S., 217; T.A., I, 282-83; Ferishta, I, 167.

⁴⁴ Yahyā and Ferishta have Seor while Nizāmuddin and Badaoni have Shor. It is certainly Shorkot 30° 50' N. 72° 6' E. Also see p. 17 n. 24.

⁴⁵ T.M.S., 217.

⁴⁶ Ferishta, I, 167.

⁴⁷ Badaoni and Ferishta write: "He (Shaikh 'Alī) removed the slave (Faulād) together with all his family and relations from Tabakhinda and taking them with himself . . . came to Lahore." Badaoni, I, 294; Ranking, I, 388-89.

This ■ not correct ■ ■ little later we find Faulād in the fort of Bhatinda fighting against the Sultanate ■ enthusiastically ■ ever.

Shaikh 'Alī left Bhatinda devastating on the way most of the districts of Rai Firōz. He crossed the Sutlej at Tīrhārā, in Ludhiana district,⁴⁸ took a large number of prisoners from Jalandhar to Jāran-Manjūr,⁴⁹ and then returned along the banks of the Beas. Crossing the Beas in April, 1431 (Rajjab) he arrived at Lahore, where its governor Mallik Sikandar saved the country from molestation by "paying him the usual customary annual tribute".⁵⁰

From Lahore Shaikh 'Alī proceeded to Tilwara, opposite Deopāpur, sacking and pillaging, and during the next twenty days he slew a large number of people and took prisoner many others.⁵¹ Reports of his atrocities made 'Imādul Mulk of Multan gird up his loins and march to Tulamba. His determination made Shaikh 'Alī retire from Tilwara, but the Sultan ordered 'Imād to avoid a conflict and return to Multan. This weak-kneed policy of Mubārak Shāh only emboldened the hired invader. He crossed the Ravi at Khatībpur, plundered the country along the banks of the Chēnab, and arrived within ten *kuroh* of Multan. 'Imādul Mulk sent Sultan Shāh Lodī to intercept Shaikh 'Alī, but the former's force came unexpectedly in contact and inevitable conflict with

⁴⁸ See note 52, p. 10.

⁴⁹ Jāran-Manjūr has been mentioned before by Amīr Khosrū and Ziyauddīn Baranī in connection with a Mongol invasion in the time of 'Alāuddīn Khaljī. *Devat Rasīd*, 60; T.F.S. (B), 250; Ferishta, I, ■■■■

The place mentioned by Baranī for Jāran Manjūr is Jalandhar. Yahyā (T.M.S., 218), however, makes ■ a place separate from Jalandhar when he says "from Jalandhar to Jāran Manjūr". Hodivala writes a long note, but gives many alternative place ■■■■ (246-47). The place was either Jalandhar itself or in its environs.

Also see K. S. Lal, *History of the Khaljīs*, 153 n. 27.

⁵⁰ T.M.S., 218; Ferishta, I, 167.

This remark of Yahyā throws much light on the position of the Punjab in which Mubārak Shāh was claiming to reassert his authority. Khizr Khen had been all obedience to Timūr and Shāh Rukh, but unlike his father, Mubārak Shāh seems to have cared little for Shāh Rukh (Ferishta, I, 167 lines 9-10). All the same from what Yahyā writes, and writes without an iota of doubt or hesitation, it ■ evident that annual tribute ■■■■ remitted to Kabul from Lahore (T.M.S., 218). Shaikh 'Alī's nephew Muzaffar used to reside at Shorkot with a large force probably to collect and remit this tribute to Kabul, and the situation ■■■■ too flattering for the Sultan of Hindustan.

⁵¹ T.M.S., 218; Ferishta, I, 167 line 15.

the latter's. Sultan Shāh was killed and his force scattered.⁵² Only a few escaped to Multan to relate the terrible tragedy.

Shaikh 'Alī occupied Khusrūbād,⁵³ situated close to Multan, and encamped at the Namāzgāh about three *kuroh* from the city. The next day he launched an assault on one of its gates, but 'Imādul Mulk returned the charge and compelled him to return to his camp. Shaikh 'Alī made two more attempts on Multan on 6 and 8 June (25 and 27 Muharram) but 'Imādul Mulk not only succeeded in saving the fort but also inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy. He was still more strengthened by reinforcements from Delhi led by Khan-i-Āzam Fatch Khan, son of Muzaffar Shāh Gujarātī, Zīrak Khan, governor of Samana, Malik Kālū the keeper of elephants, Malik Yūsuf, son of Sarwarul Mulk, and Rai Hansū Bhattī. In consultation with them 'Imādul Mulk planned an offensive and attacked Shaikh 'Alī's camp at the Namāzgāh on 13 July, 1431 (3 Zilq'ada, 834 H),⁵⁴ and so completely sacked it that Shaikh 'Alī could save himself only by taking shelter behind the pile of his baggage.⁵⁵ The imperialists chased him up to the Chēnab compelling him to cross the river. Most of his soldiers, including his nephew Hajī Kar, were killed or drowned, and only a few could effect their escape to Shorkot. Yahyā closes the narrative of this debacle with a cryptic remark: "Such a dire calamity never befell any army on any previous occasion, or in any other reign".⁵⁶ Shaikh 'Alī was thoroughly demoralised with this defeat. Leaving his nephew Muzaffar at Shorkot, he himself

⁵² T.M.S., 219; T.A., I, 282; and Badaonī, Ranking, I, 389, say he was killed. Only Ferishta, I, 167 says he ■ defeated but not killed. This may be due to a mistaken reading of *shāst* for *shakādat*.

⁵³ Nizāmuddīn and Ferishta call the place Khairābād. According to the latter it ■ situated 3 stages from Multan (T.A., I, 282; Ferishta, I, 167, line 11). Yahyā and Badaonī have Khusrūbād (T.M.S., 219 and Badaonī, I, 295, Ranking Trs. I, 389).

Neither of the place names is traceable ■ the maps now. It may, however, be the Khusrūbād of Ibn Battūta, who, while describing his journey from Sindh to Delhi, says that on the way from Uchch to Multan, he crossed the river of Khusrūbād at a distance of ten miles (probably he meant 10 *kos*) ■ the latter. Ibn Battūta, Def. and Sang., III, 117; Also Hodivala, 408.

⁵⁴ T.M.S., 221.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 221. *حصار که گرد بنگاه خورش بر آورده بود* (Fortress which ■ had built round his camp).

⁵⁶ T.M.S., 221; Badaonī's Trs., 229.

returned to Kabul. Operations against Muzaffar were stayed in pursuance of the royal mandate, and the relieving force returned to Delhi.

At Delhi Mubārak Shāh ordered the transfer of the governorship of Multan from the charge of Malik 'Imādul Mulk Mahmūd Hasan to that of Malik Khairuddin. Opinions differ on the Sultan's motive in taking the fief of Multan from the illustrious Mahmūd Hasan, about whose capability and loyalty there could hardly have been any doubt. Yahyā says, in so many words, that because the siege of Shorkot was raised the Sultan ordered this transfer, obviously to punish Mahmūd, but at another place he says that the siege was given up at the bidding of the monarch himself.⁵⁷ There may be more than a grain of truth in the statement of Ferishta that the King had become jealous of 'Imādul Mulk's popularity due to his victory over Shaikh 'Alī, and called him back to the court.⁵⁸ One should also keep in mind the unhealthy ambition of Sarwarul Mulk, who was constantly planning his rise at the cost of others, and was ever plotting towards that end. It had been at his instigation that a chain of transfers was effected in 1422 in which Mahmūd Hasan was shifted from Lahore to Jalandhar. Whatever the reasons, the transfer of 'Imādul Mulk at this critical juncture was most indiscreet, "imprudent and inconsiderate",⁵⁹ and was to create a very grave situation in Multan.

Anarchical Situation

The retreat of Shaikh 'Alī gave no respite to the Sultanate for Jasrat Khokhar was up in arms once again. His relatives had earlier joined Shaikh 'Alī and he too was keen on deriving the best advantage from the confusion created by Shaikh 'Alī's invasion.

⁵⁷ T.M.S., 223.

در اثنای آن توفیق همایون اعلیٰ رسید - کل نامردی از گرد حصار سیور برخاسته سمت شهر آمدند - بدین سبب اطلاع ملهان از ملک فخری تھویل کرده بمحواله ملک خیرالدین خانی گرجانید -

(In the meantime the imperialists, in pursuance of the royal mandate, gave up the siege of Seor, and took their way to the capital. It was for this reason that the iqt'ā of Multan was taken from Malik Mahmūd Hasan and bestowed upon Malik Khairuddin Khan.)

⁵⁸ Ferishta, I, 167, line 3 from below. ⁵⁹ T.M.S., 223.

For many years past he had kept quiet (except in 1427 when he was badly defeated at Kangra). But now, when the Sultanate was grappling with Shaikh 'Alī, Jasrat thought it an opportune time to join hands with the latter and try his strength against the Sultanate once more. At his invitation⁶⁰ Shaikh 'Alī reappeared in Multan to help Jasrat as well as to avenge his last defeat. Meanwhile the rebel emerged from his mountain retreat of Talwara, and crossing the Chēnab, the Ravi and the Beas suddenly fell upon Sikandar Tuhfā near Jalandhar in November, 1431 (Rabiul Avval, 835 H).⁶¹ Sikandar was defeated and taken prisoner. Carrying his captive along with him, Jasrat dashed upon Lahore and invested it. Lahore was bravely defended by Saiyyad Najmuddin, Sikandar's deputy, and another officer Malik Khushkhabr by name. Meanwhile Shaikh 'Alī again arrived in Multan and attacked Khatībpur and several other villages on the Chēnab, and on 23 November, 1431 (17 Rabiul Avval, 835 H) he sacked Tulamba even after he had promised amnesty to its inhabitants.⁶² About now Faulād Turkbachchā also marched out of Bhatinda, devastated the country of Rai Firōz and killed him in battle. The whole of the Punjab was now at the mercy of the rebels and invaders. The suffering of the people knew no bounds.

Mubārak Shāh was completely confounded at the turn of events, but he acted with unusual decision and promptitude. He sent the Vazīr, Sarwarul Mulk, with a large force in advance and himself followed with the army to Lahore *en route* to Multan in January, 1432. The Sultan's movements had a salutary effect. On his arrival in Samana, Jasrat raised the siege of Lahore and retreated into Talwara carrying with him the precious prisoner, Sikandar Tuhfā. Shaikh 'Alī also evacuated Tulamba and retreated towards Marwāt.⁶³

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 225; Ferishta, I, 168.

⁶¹ T.M.S., 223; Ferishta, I, 167.

⁶² T.M.S., 224; T.A., I, 283; Ferishta, I, 168.

⁶³ T.M.S., 225 has Bartot بارتوت and so has Hajjuddabir, Z. W., III, 917. Many MSS. of T.A. also have Bartot while the Bib. Ind. text has Martot. (T.A. De, 316, n. 4.) Prof. Hodivala suggests that the place meant is, perhaps, Martot or Marwāt, now a tehsil in Bannū district in Western Pakistan. It contains the town of Lakki.

Lakki-Marwat is now a Rly. station, 37 miles southeast of Bannu. Hodivala, 409. I.G., XVIII, 213. Constable, 24 Da.

on his way to Kabul.⁶⁴ Because of these developments Mubarak Shāh proceeded ■ further. He bestowed the fiefs of Jalandhar and Lahore on Khan-i-Khanān Nusrat Khan Gurgandāz (the Wolf Slayer), and deputed Sarwarul Mulk to escort the family of Sikandar Tuhfā from Lahore to Delhi.

Having somehow settled the affairs in the west, Mubarak Shāh returned to Delhi, on the way ordering 'Imādul Mulk to chastise the "rebels" of Bayana and Gwalior, obviously to collect revenue. But hardly had he turned his back on the Punjab, than Jasrat reappeared from his stronghold, and sacking the districts on the way attacked Lahore in August, 1432 (Zilhijja, 836 H).⁶⁵ At the news of Jasrat's renewed activity Mubarak Shāh marched towards Samana, but when he learnt that the rebel had been defeated by Nusrat Khan and had consequently retreated, the Sultan returned to Panipat. From there he hastened to the death-bed of his mother, Makhdūma-i-Jahān. After mourning her loss and performing the last rites, he rejoined the army at Panipat after ten days. From there he sent Malik Sarwarul Mulk, Islām Khan and Kahun Raj⁶⁶ to Bhatinda against Faulād Turkbachchā, who had grown stronger from the riches he had obtained from the country of Rai Firōz.⁶⁷ He also transferred Jalandhar and Lahore from the charge of Nusrat Khan to that of Allahadād Kālā Lodī,⁶⁸ and himself proceeded to Mewat. Jasrat Khokhar could hardly miss ■ chance of trying his strength with the new governor, and ■ Malik Allahadād was proceeding to take charge of his fief, Jasrat marched to Bajwara, defeated Allahadād, and compelled him to seek shelter in the foot hills of Kothi.⁶⁹

A little after this, it was reported that Shaikh 'Alī was once again advancing to the aid of Faulād Turkbachchā, who was being besieged at Bhatinda by the royalists. Greatly worried lest the fear of Shaikh 'Alī should prompt the royalists to abandon the siege, the Sultan immediately sent Malik 'Imādul Mulk to reinforce the besieging army and his arrival there indeed emboldened and streng-

⁶⁴ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 390; Ferishta, I, 168.

⁶⁵ T.M.S., 225.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 226 has كهن راج. T.A. does not give the name.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 226.

⁶⁸ Ferishta, I, 168. Badaoni has Kālū Lodī.

⁶⁹ T.M.S., 227. T.A., I, 284, has foothills of Kothi Bajwārā. Badaoni does not give the name of the foothill.

thened the royal officers and men.⁷⁰ But concentration of troops at one place made the work of the governor of Kabul all the more easy. He issued from Shorkot, plundered the villages along the banks of the Ravi, took a number of prisoners from Sahaniwal or Sahiwal⁷¹ (Montgomery) and arriving in Lahore began its investment. Malik Yūsuf, son of Sarwarul Mulk, Malik Isma'īl, nephew of Zīrak Khan, and Malik Raja, son of Bahār Khan, commanders of the Lahore garrison, either because of lack of confidence in themselves or because of lack of trust in the city people,⁷² fled towards Deopapur, and Shaikh 'Alī occupied Lahore without any opposition. He plundered the citizens, desecrated the mosques,⁷³ and then leaving a garrison of 2,000 troops, he marched out to attack Deopapur to which Malik Yūsuf had retired. But the wretched Yūsuf having heard of the move of Shaikh 'Alī, began to plan to abandon the fort of Deopapur just as he had abandoned that of Lahore. This was the result of promoting incompetent men. Yūsuf had never shown any talents and his rise had been due only to his intriguing father, the Vazīr. When 'Imādul Mulk, who was still besieging Bhatinda, came to learn of Yūsuf's intentions, he despatched his brother Malik Ahmad with a large force to hold Deopapur. Shaikh 'Alī had been badly mauled by 'Imādul Mulk on a former occasion and the dread of the latter's name dissuaded him from attacking the place, but he took possession of all the towns between Deopapur and Lahore.⁷⁴

The conduct of the officers who had relinquished Lahore had greatly annoyed Mubārak Shāh. He was now determined to deal with Shaikh 'Alī whatever the cost, and moved out of Delhi in February, 1433 (Jamadiul Ākhir, 837).⁷⁵ At Samana, Malik Kamāl-uddīn, who had been away towards Etawah and Gwalior, joined him. The Sultan then proceeded via Sunam to Talwāndī, where 'Imādul Mulk and Islām Khan arrived from Bhatinda for consulta-

⁷⁰ T.M.S., 228.

⁷¹ The Sahiwal of the present maps, 31° 58' N. 87° 40' E, does not fall on the route from Shorkot to Lahore. Professor Hodivala, 409, suggests, "This Sahaniwal may be Sahiwal, the old name of [] modern town of Montgomery which was founded in 1865 and lies between the Ravi and the Sutlej". Also I.G., XVIII, 419.

⁷² T.A., I, 285.

⁷³ T.M.S., 228-29.

⁷⁴ T.A., I, 285; T.M.S., 229.

⁷⁵ T.M.S., 229; T.A., I, 285.

tions. Sending instructions to the other Amirs at Bhatinda not to abandon its siege,⁷⁶ the Sultan moved towards the Ravi. Alarmed by Mubarak Shāh's movements and his all-round preparations, Shaikh 'Alī began to pack up for the return march. When Mubarak Shāh reached Deopulpur, Shaikh 'Alī had already crossed the Chenab.⁷⁷ 'Imādul Mulk was sent in pursuit of the fleeing Shaikh 'Alī, while Malik Sikandar Tughlāq, who had secured his release from Jasrat Khokhar on payment of a heavy ransom,⁷⁸ was given the title of Shamsul Mulk, and ordered to invest Lahore which was held by the garrison left by Shaikh 'Alī. The Sultan himself proceeded to deal with his nephew Amir Muzaffar at Shorkot. He crossed the Ravi at Tulamba and arriving at the fort, laid siege to it. Shorkot capitulated to the Sultan after a month's resistance in May, 1433 (Ramzān).⁷⁹ Muzaffar made complete submission, married his daughter to the King's son,⁸⁰ paid a large tribute and vacated the fort the next month. In the meantime 'Imādul Mulk, who was chasing Shaikh 'Alī, succeeded in capturing a number of his horse and a good amount of his goods.

Mubarak Shāh had at last succeeded in putting an end to the disorder in the North-Western part of his kingdom. His achievement gave him mental relief too. In all happiness and gratitude he went on a pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy saints at Multan. Incidentally he also checked up on the management of public affairs in those parts, and then returned to Deopulpur. To

⁷⁶ T.M.S., 230; Ferishta, I, 168 and T.A., I, 285.

The language of Yahyā and Ferishta is quite clear امرای دیگر را فرمان داد تا از گوردوارہ (Directed the other nobles not to abandon the siege of the fort.) But Nizāmuddin Ahmad [] the words رخصت (rise, that is, raise the siege) in place of فرار (not to get away), and this has misled both Sir Wolsley Haig and [] De, the translator of the *Tabqāt-i-Akbari*, into believing that the Amirs were ordered to leave the neighbourhood of Tabarkhind. T.A., De's trs. 319; C.H.I., III, 219.

Later events also show that Yahyā and Ferishta [] correct and the mistake of Nizāmuddin is probably only of the scribe.

⁷⁷ T.A., I, 286.

⁷⁸ Ferishta, I, 168 line 6 from below. ⁷⁹ T.M.S., 230.

⁸⁰ T.M.S., 230; T.A., I, 286. Ferishta, I, 168 line 13 from below says, Muzaffar "gave his daughter to the King". Badaoni, Ranking, I, 392 [] "gave his daughter, together with a large amount of money and valuables, to the prince".

guard against further incursions of Shaikh 'Alī, Muḥarak Shāh placed Lahore and Deopāpur under the charge of 'Imādul Mulk,⁸¹ and his district of Bayana was bestowed upon Shamsul Mulk Sikandar Tuhfā.⁸² Leaving the army under the charge of Kamālul Mulk, the monarch returned in all happiness to celebrate the 'Id⁸³ in the capital city where he arrived on the auspicious day itself.

⁸¹ Here Basu's translation of the T.M.S. is defective and confused. He is inclined to think that Lahore was bestowed upon Shaikh 'Alī himself. T.M.S., 231, Basu's Trs., 138.

⁸² T.M.S., 231; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 392.

⁸³ Badaoni has 'Id-i-Qurbān or Festival of Sacrifice. This falls on the 10th day of Zilhijja. It is the 'Id-i-Kabir distinguished from 'Id-i-Fitr in which is celebrated the termination of the fast of Ramṣān. Ranking, I, 392 and n; T.P. Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, 192, 196.

Chapter 6

THE PROBLEM TRACT

Katchar—Bayana—Mewat—Doab

BESIDES THE PUNJAB, the recalcitrant western Uttar Pradesh with its numerous independent principalities formed another problem-tract for Mubārak Shāh Saiyyad. The eastern U. P. had already been gradually occupied by Jaunpur. It could not be reclaimed until the Jaunpur kingdom was destroyed and this was beyond the power of the Saiyyads. So the Saiyyad monarchs concentrated ■ re-establishing their authority in western U. P. only. This was the policy of Khizr Khan, and of his successors. However, ever since his accession right up to A. D. 1433, Mubārak Shāh's attention and armies were concentrated on the Punjab, and he could deal with the problem-tract of western Uttar Pradesh only in a desultory manner.

For a year and ■ half since Mubārak's accession, his attention had been kept concentrated on the Punjab by Jasrat Khokhar, giving a welcome opportunity to the Rajas and Zamindars of U. P. to avoid payment of tribute. Having finished with Jasrat for the time being, the Sultan marched into Katchar at the beginning of A. D. 1423 (Muharram, 826 H),¹ and began to exact revenue and tribute at the point of the sword. Mahābat Khan of Badaon,² who had defied Khizr Khan in his last days, fearing the Sultan's wrath, submitted to him and joined him in his expedition. They crossed the Ganga and ravaged the territory of the Rathors, putting ■ large number of them to the sword. Such behaviour so alarmed Rai Sumer's son Deva Rai, who had submitted to Khizr Khan in 1421 and was all along in the suite of the Sultan, that he fled to Etawah. He successfully defended the town against Malik Khairuddin Tuhfā, brother of Sikandar Tuhfā, who was tricked into raising

¹ T.M.S., ■■■

² It was ■ important out-post in the fifteenth century and its governors, who were always chosen from among the best nobles, had to keep the Katchariyā Rajputs under control.

the siege on a promise, and not actual payment, of tribute.³ The Sultan who came back in Delhi in May, 1423 (Jamadiul Ākhir, 826 H)⁴ was not naturally happy at Khairuddin's performance and transferred his charge of 'Āriz-i-Mumālīk to Malik Mahmūd Hasan, a nobleman "worthy, righteous and trustworthy".⁵

Jasrat was not slow to take advantage of the Sultan's preoccupation in the east; he attacked and killed the Raja of Jammu and invited Shaikh 'Alī from Kabul. Shaikh 'Alī did not come, but trouble was reported from another quarter. It was reported that Sultan Hoshang Shāh of Malwa⁶ was marching upon Gwalior.⁷ A prince of restless and unscrupulous disposition, Hoshang constantly provoking wars on all fronts,—against Gujarat, Bahmani and Jaunpur kingdoms. It is not surprising, therefore, that he wanted to try his strength with the Sultanate of Delhi also. Refusing to learn a lesson from his defeat at the hands of the king of Gujarat in March, 1423 (Rabiul Ākhir, 826 H),⁸ Hoshang Shāh shortly after proceeded to attack Gwalior. Though the Raja of Gwalior was independent and not always loyal to Delhi, Gwalior was deemed to form a part of the Sultanate; hence Mubārak Shāh started with a large force to defend it. On the way, he brought to book Muhammad Khan Auhadi⁹ of Bayana who, having assassinat-

³ According to Ferishta, I, 164, a son of the Rai was sent to the King as a hostage for his father's future good conduct.

⁴ T.M.S. Text has Jamadiul Avval. In a note Basu adds that another MS. has Ākhir. JNS and Elliot's MSS. also have Jamadiul Ākhir. T.M.S., Basu's tra., 208 n. 1. ⁵ T.M.S., 201.

⁶ Some chroniclers have Dhar, Ferishta has Malwa. The towns of Ujjain and Dhar have supplied capitals to Malwa from the time of the legendary Hindu dynasties. Hunter, Imp. Gaz., IV, 245.

⁷ Yahyā, followed by all other historians, writes Alp Khan. Ferishta, I, 165; II, 238, gives only the title. Nizāmuddin writes both, saying "Alp Khan, the governor of Dhar who had taken the name of Sultan Hoshang". T.A., I, 275. Hoshang had ascended the throne in A.D. 1407 (810 H).

⁸ Ferishta, II, 238.

⁹ T.M.S., 102. Ferishta, I, 165, has Amīr Khan, son of Dāūd Khan, son of Shams Khan, ruler of Bayana. T.A. also has the same (I, 275). Badaoni has Shams Khan Auhadi, son of Auhad Khan, and is followed by Ferishta and all others. But while here Ferishta has Amīr Khan, a few lines later he has Muhammad Khan, and thus he contradicts himself, but not Yahyā. Muhammad Khan may therefore be accepted. At this place Badaoni and Nizāmuddin also have Muhammad Khan.

ed his uncle Mubārak Khan, had risen in revolt. The Sultan sacked Bayana¹⁰ but later pardoned and reinstated Muhammad when he had paid tribute and put "his neck into the collar of obedience".¹¹ Meanwhile Hoshang Shāh arrived at Gwalior, invested the fort¹² and stationed troops to guard the fords on the river Chambal.¹³ Mubārak's advance-guard, led by Malik Mahmūd Hasan and Nusrat Khan, managed to cross the river by an unfrequented ford and in a surprise attack seized some prisoners and goods, but the Sultan set the captives free on the ground that they were all Muhammedan. This gesture ■ well as the desire of both sides not to enter into a general conflict, brought about peace and presents were exchanged. Hoshang returned to Malwa, but the Sultan stayed on in the Chambal region "levying contribution on the infidels", before finally returning to Delhi in June, 1424 (Rajjab, 827 H).¹⁴

In the winter of A. D. 1424 (Muharram, 828 H)¹⁵ Mubārak Shāh marched towards Katehar. The last he had been there ■ two years back, in December 1422, and revenues from that turbulent region had fallen into arrears. To punish its ruler the Sultan plundered the country as far as the foot of the Kumaon hills¹⁶ and compelled Rai Har Singh to pay three years' revenue and tribute,¹⁷ in place of two. He then descended into the Doab, but a recent famine and consequent scarcity of provisions there compelled him to retire towards Mewat where the Mewatis, habitually addicted to rebellion, were up in arms. There too he did not gain anything

¹⁰ Bayana or Biana in the erstwhile Bharatpur state in Rajasthan, lies 50 miles S.W. of Agra.

¹¹ T.M.S., 202. ¹² Ferishta, II, 238.

¹³ Chambal is one of the principal tributaries of the Jumna. It rises in Malwa, flows through Central India where it is joined by Kali Sind, Parbati and Banna, and falls into the Jumna 40 miles south of Etawah. Hunter, Imp. Gaz., III, 337.

¹⁴ T.M.S., 202-03; also Ferishta, I, 165, II, 238.

¹⁵ T.M.S., 203; Ferishta, I, 165; T.A., I, 273. Only Badaoni (Ranking, I, 385) has 827 H.

¹⁶ T.M.S., 203. Badaoni also writes that he went ■ Kumaon and Katehar. (Ranking, I, 385). T.A. does not mention Kumaon but follows T.M.S. in other details. Ferishta's account ■ very brief. He does not only not mention Kumaon, but says that after punishing the rebels (of Katehar) the Sultan returned to Delhi. Ferishta, I, 165.

¹⁷ T.M.S., 203; Ferishta, I, 165, and T.A., I, 275.

much, for the Mewatts, after destroying their effects,¹⁸ fled to the mountains of Tijārā, their stronghold.¹⁹ Their scorched-earth policy had rendered pursuit difficult and the Sultan returned to Delhi in June, 1425 (Rajjab, 828 H)²⁰ determined to visit the country again. Thus, in those days a supply corps was thought to be a superfluity. The invading army depended for its supplies on the loot in the enemy country; and ordinarily there should have been no difficulty for Mubārak. But uncertain conditions for more than a generation like instability of government, Tīmūr's invasion, constant campaigns against petty rulers and zamindars and consequent harassment of the peasantry with no thought of providing irrigation facilities or remitting land revenue in times of difficulty had greatly affected agricultural production.

Next year when the Sultan marched into Mewat, Jalāl Khan and Qadr Khan, the grandsons of Bahādur Nāhar (contemptuously called Jallū and Qaddū by the chroniclers), repeated their tactics of laying waste their country and retired into the hill fortress of Indūr.²¹ There they were besieged and after "making dying struggles"²² they fled to Alwar.²³ The Sultan dismantled Indūr and proceeding to Alwar laid siege to it. Unable to hold on against a superior force, Jallū and Qaddū sued for peace. Amnesty was

■ B.M. and J.N.S. ■■■. (Basu's Trs. n. on p. 217) of the T.M.S. have *کل خلق را خراب کرده*, which Elliot translates as "having driven off all the population". But Nizāmuddin has the correct version: "Leaving their country unoccupied and in ruins". T.A., I, 276.

¹⁸ T.M.S., 204 has *درین کوه سحره که محکم ترین جایگاه اجداست* (In the hill of Jahrah, their *point d'appui*). Earlier when Bahādur Nāhar fleeing from the Kotla had taken refuge ■ Aug.-Sept., 1393, he had sought shelter in the mountain of جهر (Jahar). T.M.S., 154. Ferishta on this occasion reads the place ■■■■■ (Panjabar). In ■ probability the place meant is Tijārā only. Also Hodivala, 405.

■ T.M.S., 204; Ferishta, I, 165; T.A., I, 276.

¹⁹ Indūr is mentioned in the *Āfn.* (trs., II, 192) as a Mahāl in Sarkar Tijara. Its fort was situated on a high hill. "It is now a ruined town lying about ten miles east of Tijara." Powlett, *Gazetteer of Alwar*, 134-5.

It ■ a well-known stronghold of the Mewatts. According to Elliot it lies on the western brow of the Mawat hills between Nūh and Kotla, ■ miles south of Nūh. Elliot, *Reces*, II, 88, 100.

²¹ T.A., I, 276.

■ Alwar is in Rajasthan, Lat. 27° 4' and Long. 76° 7'.

granted to them; but Qadr Khan, who was suspected of double-dealing, was imprisoned.²⁴ Mubārak Shāh returned to Delhi in July, 1426 (Sh'abān, 829 H).

The end of the year A. D. 1426 found Mubārak Shāh in Bayana. He had marched through Mewat sacking it on the way. On his arrival in Bayana, Muhammad Khan Aubadī shut himself up in the fort which was situated on the summit of a hill. But some deserters²⁵ from his ranks indicated to the Sultan a secret passage to the mountain fastness and he entered it — Friday, 31 January, 1427 (2 Rabiul Ākhir, 830 H).²⁶ At the sudden appearance of the royal forces, Muhammad Khan lost his nerve and sued for peace. Mubārak Shāh showed no clemency, took possession of everything Muhammad possessed and sent him with his family a prisoner in the palace of Jahān Numa.²⁷ He divided the iqt'ā into two. Bayana proper was put in the charge of Muqbil Khan and the pargana of Sikrī²⁸ in charge of Malik Khairuddin Tuhfā. Collecting tribute from the Rais of Gwalior, Thankir²⁹ and Chandwār the Sultan arrived back in Delhi in April, 1427 (Jamadiul Ākhir, 830 H).³⁰

But Bayana would not let Mubārak Shāh rest in peace. Shortly after his internment, Muhammad Khan Aubadī effected his escape. He collected most of his old followers in Mewat and attacked the royal garrison of Bayana. Malik Muqbil was out — an expedition to Mahāban,³¹ and the scanty following of Khairuddin Tuhfā³²

²⁴ T.M.S., 204. According to Ferishta both Jalū and Qaddū tried to escape but were imprisoned. Yahyā and Nizāmuddin, however, speak of the confinement of Qaddū only.

²⁵ Ferishta, I, 165.

²⁶ T.M.S., 205.

²⁷ The text of T.M.S. has Jahānpanah (p. 205). — another MS. it is given Kaushak-i-Jahān-numā (p. 205 n. 8). Ferishta and Badaoni have Jahān Numa. Nizāmuddin only says that Muhammad was sent to Delhi.

²⁸ Sikrī, later celebrated as Fatehpur Sikrī where Akbar built his capital, lies 18 miles west of Agra. Strangely enough, K. K. Basu has confused it with another Fatehpur lying 80 miles west of Allahabad and writes a long note on p. 313 of his translation of the *Tarikh-i-Mubarrak Shāhī*.

²⁹ E and D., IV, 63 has Bhangar.

³⁰ T.M.S., 206.

³¹ T.M.S., 206 has مہارن; T.A., I, 277 has مہارن; Ferishta, I, 165, has مہارن. It is the modern Mahāban, in Mathura district, U.P., near the left bank of the Jumna, 27° 27' N. — 77° 45' E.

³² T.M.S., 206; T.A., I, 277. Ferishta — Nāsiroddin, I, 165.

could not withstand the attack. He fled to Delhi and Muhammad Anhadl once more occupied the fort. At this the Sultan sent Malik Mubārīz with a large force, but when he learnt that Muhammad Khan had appealed to the king of Jaunpur for help, Mubārak Shāh himself marched in person to Bayana in October, 1427 (Muharram, 831 H).²²

Jaunpur

Sultan Shamsuddīn Ibrāhīm Sharqī, "as good a master of pen as of sword", ruled over Jaunpur for forty years from A. D. 1401 to 1440.²³ All his life he not only constantly fought his neighbours—the Sultans of Delhi, Bengal and Malwa—but also found time to embellish his capital with magnificent buildings and patronise art and letters. In the desert of the strife and confusion prevailing in Hindustan, Jaunpur was like an oasis of learning, art and culture. The court of Jaunpur during the forty years of Ibrāhīm's rule far eclipsed that of Delhi, and was the resort of all the learned men of the east. People were happy under his benign rule and saints and scholars and artists flocked to Jaunpur from all parts of Hindustan and abroad. According to Ferishta, Ibrāhīm's court rivalled that of Iran and his capital came to be addressed as the second Shirāz.²⁴

Ibrāhīm Sharqī could hardly miss the opportunity offered by the appeal of Muhammad Khan of Bayana, for trying his strength with that of the Delhi Sultan. He had already prepared an elaborate scheme of invading the Doab. In the south his target was Kalpi, in the north Badaon, and had his schemes materialised, Mubārak Shāh would have found himself relieved of the whole of the Doab. Thus, as Mubārak Shāh was marching towards Bayana, he received an urgent appeal for help from Qādir Khan, governor of Kalpi,²⁵ to the effect that the king of Jaunpur was marching upon Kalpi. Mubārak Shāh at once turned towards the south-west to meet Ibrāhīm, checkmate his plans on Kalpi and prevent

²² T.M.S., 207.

²³ Nizāmuddīn gives the date of his death as 840 H (A.D. 1436). But some coins show that he was alive up to 844 H (A.D. 1440). J.A.S.B., XVIII, 135, 157. Also Ferishta, II, 305-6.

²⁴ Ferishta, II, 305-306.

²⁵ Kalpi is in Jalaua District, U.P., Lat. 26° 8' N. and Long. 79° 45' E.

him from joining Muhammad Auhadī at Bayana. The Sharqī king had already sacked Bhongaon in the Doab and was now advancing upon Badaon lying fifty miles north of it. Mubārak Shāh forded the Jumna at Tappal, sacked Chartoli or Jartauli³⁷ and arrived at Atrauli,³⁸ lying 16 miles east of Aligarh. Ibrāhīm continued his advance along the banks of the Āb-i-Siyāh ■ Kalindī and reached Burhanabad in Etawah district, while Mubārak Shāh left Atrauli in his pursuit. But the Sharqī king avoided giving battle and moved to Rapri.³⁹ Crossing the Jumna at the ford of Nārang,⁴⁰ he succeeded in reaching Bayana, the friendly country of Muhammad Auhadī, and encamped on the river Gambhīr.⁴¹ Mubārak Shāh marched close at his heels, crossed the Jumna at Chandwār and encamped at ■ distance of four kos⁴² from the enemy. The two forces dug trenches and consolidated their positions.⁴³ For twenty-two days minor skirmishes were fought, whereupon Ibrāhīm Sharqī decided to give a final battle. On Wednesday 24 March, 1428 (7 Jamādī ul Ākhir) he left his trenches and arrayed his army, footmen and cavalry, on the plain. At this Mubārak Shāh's courage failed him, and although he ordered Sikandar Tuhfā and other officers to march into battle, he himself along with many important officers like his Vazīr, Sarwarul Mulk, refrained from personally

³⁷ Badaoni has جرتولی (Jartauli) and Elliot Haroli. T.M.S., 207 also has جرتول. Col. Ranking says he is unable to find the place. This Haroli or Jartauli is Thornton's Jarowlee lying 28 miles N.E. of Aligarh on the road from Aligarh to Moradabad.

■ Atrauli was a Mahāl in Sarkar Kol or Aligarh in Akbar's time. It lies 16 miles N.E. of Aligarh. *Āin*, II, 186; *Hunter, Imp. Gaz.*, I, 186.

³⁸ T.M.S., 208.

³⁹ The word Gudrang گدرنگ has been written by Yahyā. No such place exists. It may be a mistaken reading for گدرگ or ford, or گدرنگ the ford of Nārang. It is stated in the Mainpuri Gazetteer that at Nārang the Jumna contracts to a width of about ■ yards in winter, thus providing a natural ford. It lies very near Rapri. Ferishta and Nizāmuddīn do not make mention of any ford but only say that Ibrāhīm Sharqī crossed the Jumna near Rapri. *U.P. Gazetteer*, X, 248-49.

⁴¹ T.M.S., 208 correctly has آب کهنر. Badaoni has Āb-i-Katehar. Elliot has "river of Katehar". Obviously river Gambhīr ■ meant. Bayana lies close to the left bank of Gambhīr.

■ T.M.S., 208; *Ferishta*, II, 306; *T.A.* ■ ■ kos.

⁴⁰ *Ferishta*, I, 156; II, 306.

participating in it.⁴⁴ The battle began at noon and raged till dusk when the rival forces withdrew to their respective encampments. Having failed to win a decisive victory, Sultan Ibrāhīm decided to retire. He crossed the Jumna at the ford of Nārang, and passing through Rapri returned to his own country by successive marches.

With the retreat of Ibrāhīm Sharqī, Muhammad Khan Auhadī was rendered helpless. Abandoning the fort on 22 May, 1428 (26 Rajjab, 831 H), he went away towards Mewat. Mubārak Shāh remained at Bayana for three weeks to arrange for its administration, and then appointing Mahmūd Hasan as its governor, returned to Delhi.

Two months later he sent an expedition to Mewat, where Muhammad Auhadī had taken refuge. During the last war Qadr Khan (Qaddū) had been found to be in secret correspondence with Ibrāhīm Sharqī. Consequently, the Sultan ordered his death. Qadr Khan's execution enraged his brother Jalāl Khan (Jalū) and other Mewatī leaders, who rose in revolt. Sarwarul Mulk marched to suppress them, and laid siege to the fort of Indūr.⁴⁵ The Mewatīs could not hold on for long and purchased their peace by giving "revenue, tribute and hostages".⁴⁶ By the end of A.D. 1428 Mahmūd Hasan, who had been deputed to Bayana, had crushed whatever recalcitrant elements had remained there. As a reward he was confirmed in his fief of Hisār Firōzā.⁴⁷

Taking advantage of the preoccupation of the royal armies

⁴⁴ T.M.S., 208-9. T.A., I, 278; Ferishta, I, 166.

⁴⁵ T.M.S., 212; Ferishta, I, 166. E and D., IV, 66 has fort of Alwar.

⁴⁶ T.M.S., 212.

⁴⁷ According to Yahyā it was in Jamādīul Ākhir 830 H (March-April A.D. 1427) that Mahmūd Hasan was given Hisār Firōzā and [redacted] Rajjab Nadira was transferred to Multan (T.M.S., 206). At p. 213, however, Yahyā again mentions that Hisār Firōzā was conferred upon Mahmūd Hasan after his return from Bayana. It appears that Mahmūd Hasan was constantly busy fighting and could not [redacted] charge of his assignment [redacted] the first [redacted] sion. But being highly favoured by the Sultan, he was once again confirmed in Hisār Firōzā. Mahmūd Hasan's promotion was only on the grounds of merit. In the early years of Mubārak Shāh's reign he had successfully fought Jasrat Khokhar. Later [redacted] he had made a stand against Shāikh 'Alī of Kabul. It were his capabilities as a soldier that Bayana, the key province, was given to him. Badaonī also [redacted] that the "fortress of Firōzā was confirmed to him". Text, I, 293; Ranking, I, 387.

in Bayana and Mewat, Jasrat Khokhar, who was lying low for the last five years, became restive again and laid siege to Kalanaur. Sikandar Tuhfā rushed from Lahore ■ the aid of its governor Ghālib Khan, and there defeated the rebel. But the event diverted Mubārak Shāh's attention from the western U.P. to the Punjab. In July 1429, Malik Rajjab Nadira of Multan died, and the governorship of Multan was restored to Mahmūd Hasan, who was given the title of Imādul Mulk or Pillar of the State. Having thus settled the affairs in the west, Mubārak Shāh again marched to Bayana in the winter of the same year. He also went to Gwalior, Hatkanth and Rapri ■ the usual revenue collecting expeditions. He transferred the charge of Rapri from the ■ of Hasan Khan to that of Malik Hamza. As he moved from Rapri, Saiyyad Sālim of Bhatinda breathed his last. His slave Faulād ■ in rebellion and the Sultan had to rush to Bhatinda to deal with him. The situation became extremely complicated at the appearance of Shaikh 'Alī in the Punjab, first at the invitation of Faulād and later at that of Jasrat Khokhar. Consequently the Sultan could not look to the affairs in the east for four long years.

At last finding a break in the activities of Shaikh 'Alī, he ordered Imādul Mulk to Bayana and himself marched ■ November, 1432 (Rabiul Avval, 836 H) against Mewat, where Jalāl Khan Mewati was again in revolt. On the Sultan's arrival at Taoru,⁴⁸ Jalāl Khan first shut himself up in the stronghold of Indūr, and later in the Kotla.⁴⁹ The Sultan made Tijara his headquarters and sacked the greater part of Mewat. Finding resistance futile, Jalāl Khan made his submission on the usual terms of a present payment and promise of good behaviour. Here at Tijara, Imādul ■ rejoined the Sultan after having returned from the expedition to Bayana. Mubārak Shāh despatched Malik Kamāluddīn to bring Gwalior and Etawah to obedience and himself returned to the capital in January, 1433 (Jamadiul Avval).⁵⁰ only to march to the Punjab against Shaikh 'Alī, ■ whom he ultimately inflicted a crushing defeat.

⁴⁸ T.M.S., 227. T.A., I, 284 wrongly has Nawar. Taoru was a ■ in the Sarkar of Rewari, Sūba Agra, Ain. Tra., II, 293. It is situated about 20 miles east of Rewari. It is now a pargana in Nūh Tehsil, Gurgaon District, East Punjab.

⁴⁹ T.M.S., 227. ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 227.

Murder of Mubārak Shāh

In August, 1433 (late Zilhijja, 836 H)⁵¹ Malik Kamāluddīn, entitled *Malikūl Sharq Kamālul Mulk*, arrived in the capital with his troops. Of late his credit had risen with the Sultan. He had done excellent work and had exhibited extreme loyalty during the past few months. All historians bear testimony to his sobriety, sagacity and experience.⁵² On the contrary Sarwarul Mulk, who had ever basked in the sunshine of royal benignity and held the two highest offices of the Vazīr (Prime Minister) and the Divān (Finance Minister), had been remiss in the performance of his duties.⁵³ He was an extremely intriguing man and as early as September 1422, taking advantage of the absence of the Vazīr, Sikandar Tuhfā, in the Punjab against Jasrat Khokhar, had induced the Sultan to transfer the Vazārat to him and give the governorship of Delhi to his son Malik Yūsuf. Sikandar was made governor of Lahore from where Mahmūd Hasan, whose record of work against Jasrat Khokhar had been simply excellent, was shifted to Jalandhar. As Sir Wolseley Haig rightly observes: "These changes bred much discontent; to which may be traced the assassination of Mubārak Shāh which took place twelve years later".⁵⁴

Now the Sultan, who wanted to reward Kamāluddīn, added the work of financial administration (*Kār-i-Ashrāf*)⁵⁵ to his portfolio of Deputy Military Secretary (*Nāib-i-Lashkar*),⁵⁶ although the formality of depriving Sarwarul Mulk of the post of Divān was not observed. It was in fact not only to reward Kamālul Mulk that Mubārak Shāh had effected the change, but also to reduce the power of the Vazīr. Khizr Khan had employed his Vazīr, Tājul Mulk, largely on military duties and so had Mubārak Shāh employed his Vazīrs, Sikandar Tuhfā and Sarwarul Mulk.

⁵¹ Yahyā states (T.M.S., 231) that Kamālul Mulk arrived on 1 Zilhijja, since the 'Id-us-Zuhā or 'Id-i-Kabīr falls on 10 Zilhijja and since Kamālul Mulk arrived in Delhi after the Sultan, he could not have come on 1 Zilhijja. Yahyā is ordinarily correct in his dates, but here he, or his scribe, has obviously slipped up. The arrival of Kamālul Mulk may be on the last but not the day of Zilhijja.

⁵² T.M.S., 231; Ferishta, I, 169; T.A., I, 286.

⁵³ T.M.S., 232. ⁵⁴ C.H.I., III, 212.

⁵⁵ T.M.S., 232; Ferishta, I, 168-69.

⁵⁶ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 393.

This had greatly enhanced the powers and prestige of the Vazirs. The present Vazir had become all in all. He was chief of the Army, Finance Minister and Auditor General (Ashraf). Mubarak Shah, therefore, had very good reasons to put a check on his power by appointing Kamalul Mulk as Auditor General and asking the Vazir to manage the finance department jointly with him.⁸⁷

Sarwar continued to be the Vazir, but the division of his portfolio rankled in his heart. And when his influence and prestige were eclipsed by the more energetic and popular Kamaluddin, he flew into paroxysms of rage. Sarwarul Mulk had yet another thorn in his side; he had been deprived of Deopapur. There can be no doubt that the policy of the Sultan of constant transfers and changes of assignments must have bred discontent, but excepting the last one, in all other transactions Sarwarul Mulk had been the gainer and not the loser. He was as ungrateful as he was scheming. He forgot all the favours the King had bestowed upon him from time to time, but gloated with bitterness over the loss of the finance portfolio. In sheer desperation he conspired with Miran Sadr the Nāib-i-'Ariz-i-Mumalik, Qazi Abdus Samad the Royal Chamberlain, and scions of two rich Khattri families of Delhi to do away with the King.⁸⁸ For generations Miran Sadr and his relations had been obliged to the royal family and had held several high offices,⁸⁹ but this did not deter him from lending a hand in the conspiracy for which there was no justification. Outwardly things went on smoothly as ever, but the traitors lay in waiting for an opportunity to strike.

Meanwhile, ■■■■ earlier, Shaikh 'Ali was thrown out of India and his nephew Muzaffar made complete submission to the Sultan (May, 1433). Mubarak's joy knew ■■■■ bounds. He went on pilgrimage to Multan, effected important transfers and decided to build a new city in keeping with the traditions of the Sultans of Delhi. On Sunday, 1 November, 1433 (17 Rabiul Awwal, 837 H)⁹⁰ the foundations of Mubarakabad ■■■■ laid ■■■■ the bank of the

⁸⁷ Tripathi, *op. cit.*, 188.

⁸⁸ T.M.S., 232; Ferishta, I, 169; T.A., I, 286-87.

⁸⁹ Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 393.

⁹⁰ T.M.S., 232; Ferishta, I, 169; T.A., I, 287.

Jumna.⁴¹ The Sultan was so enthusiastic about the new township that he used to go to its site pretty often and personally supervise its construction.

Meanwhile news was brought that the siege of Bhatinda had at length been brought to a successful close, the fort had been captured and Faulād killed. A little later Mīrān Sadr brought the head of the rebel. Mubārak Shāh could hardly restrain his joy at such a happy event; he paid a flying visit to Bhatinda to arrange for its administration and punish the zamindar accomplices of the rebel. On his return, he learnt from travellers coming into Delhi (was the intelligence service ■ inefficient?) that a war had broken out between Sultan Hoshang of Malwa and Sultan Ibrāhīm of Jaunpur for the possession of Kalpi. Kalpi was in the royal dominions and any attack on it from any quarter was an affront to the royal authority which Mubārak Shāh ■ determined to vindicate.⁴² He sent orders to his Amirs and governors to report with their armies and began preparations to march to the relief of Kalpi. On hearing of Mubārak Shāh's determination, Ibrāhīm returned to Jaunpur, but Hoshang Shāh, undaunted, attacked and captured the city from the royal governor Abdul Qādir, better known as Qādir Shāh.⁴³ Mubārak Shāh now collected his forces at the Chautra of Shergarh for the expedition.

But Sarwarul Mulk, who was waiting for an opportunity, now set to work Mīrān Sadr and the Khattri desperadoes to finish off the Sultan before the latter moved far away from the capital. On 19 February, 1434 (9 Rajjab, 837 H)⁴⁴ the Sultan went to the site of Mubārakābād only with a few attendants. As he got busy

⁴¹ There ■ ■ difference of opinion about the site of the city. Col. Mackenzie in his map places it half way between Sahpoor and Roshan Sarai, but he forgets that Yahyā ■ emphatic about its being built ■ the Jumna (T.M.S., 232). So also has been said by Nizāmuddīn ■ Badaoni. (T.A., I, 287; Badaoni, I, 279). Yahyā's testimony is of the greatest value ■ he witnessed ■ laying of the foundations of the city in question. In all probability the modern village of Mubārakpur is the site of Mubārakābād. The tomb of Mubārak Shāh (who was killed there) still stands there and the village has most certainly derived its name from the ancient monument. Also Āsar, 26 and 41; Journal Asiatique, 90; J.A.S.B., 1866, 216 and Map; J.A.S.B., 1870, 83; Thomas, *Chronicles*, 332-33.

⁴² Ferishta, I, 169; II, 306; T.A., I, 287; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 394.

⁴³ Ferishta, II, 306.

⁴⁴ T.M.S., 234; Ferishta, I, 169.

with his evening prayers, Mīrūn Sadr craftily removed the few guards and Sadhāran, son of Gangū Khattī, ⁴⁵ posted himself at the door to prevent any outside relief. Next moment Sidh Pāl, grandson of Gangū, appeared from his hiding and struck Mubārak Shāh with his sword while Sidh Pāl's slave Rānū completed the work with ■ spear.⁴⁶

Mubārak Shāh's murder ■ ■ ■ sad end of an unfortunate king. He had ruled for a little more than thirteen lunar years⁴⁷ under extremely trying circumstances. Ever since his accession, the Punjab had been at the mercy of local rebels or foreign invaders. The Khokhars, the Turkbachchās and Shaikh 'Alī were occupying or sacking one or the other of its regions. The aim of the rebels was to carve out an independent kingdom, the aim of Shaikh 'Alī was loot and plunder. Because of the preoccupations of the Sultan in the Punjab, the ever restless western Uttar Pradesh grew still more restive. Mewat, Gwalior, Etawah and most of the districts of western Uttar Pradesh hardly cared for the Sultanate or the Sultan, and only paid some tribute when forced to do so. Withal the kings of Jaunpur and Malwa tried to grab at the Sultanate's territories. Mubārak Shāh fought against the rebels and the foreign free-booters to the best of his resources and always remained at their heels. He and his officers did commendable work. They repeatedly chased out the invaders and stamped out local rebellions. But they hardly succeeded in alleviating the suffering of the people of the Punjab, who must have suffered untold privations for more than a decade. At last when the foreign menace had ended and the rebels were made to lie low, Mubārak Shāh himself succumbed to the knives of the traitors. The benefits of his strenuous efforts were nullified by his untimely death.

⁴⁵ T.M.S., 234 has *سیدارون کاتک*. Ferishta, I, 169 explicitly has *سیدارون ولد کاتک*.

⁴⁶ T.M.S., 235; Ferishta, I, 169.

⁴⁷ Yahyā and all other historians wrongly say ■ ■ ■ Mubārak Shāh ruled for thirteen years, three ■ ■ ■ and ■ ■ ■ days. T.M.S., 235; Badsani, Ranking, I, 394, text, 299; T.A., I, 287 and Ferishta, I, 169.

They themselves give the date of his accession as 19 Jamādī al Avval, 824 H (T.M.S., 193; Ferishta, I, 163) and, therefore, his reign would come to thirteen years, one month and twenty days (lunar) only.

Chapter 7

AZ DEHLI TĀ PĀLAM

Muhammad Shāh

AFTER MUBARAK SHAH'S murder Sarwarul Mulk, to cover up his crime, immediately raised to the throne Mubarak's nephew and adopted son Muhammad, an offspring of the late King's brother Farid Khan.¹ The formality of obtaining the assent of the "Amirs, Maliks, Imāns, Saiyyads, grandees, people, 'Ulemā and Qazis" was also gone through.² All the nobles who were staunch in their loyalty to the late Sultan were sent to prison.³

The treacherous Vazīr took possession of the treasury, the armoury and the elephants.⁴ All the traitors were rewarded with, or they obtained for themselves, honours and titles. Sarwarul Mulk got the title of Khan-i-Jahān and Mīrān Sadr that of Mu'īn-ul Mulk. The Vazīr kept in his possession the best parganas near the capital,⁵ while the other good ones he distributed among his associates. Sidh Pāl, Sidhāran and their kinsmen were rewarded with Amroha, Narnaul, Kuhram and some districts in the Doab, and Rānū, a slave of Sidh Pāl,⁶ was given the Shiqq of Bayana.⁷

Since Sarwarul Mulk had concentrated all power in his hands, Sultan Muhammad could not but be a showboy in his hands, but his black deeds had shocked every one, and the embers of hatred against the traitors kept on smouldering. When Rānū arrived at Bayana to take possession, he was opposed and killed by its governor Yūsuf Khan Auhadi, who cut off Rānū's head and hung it up at the gate of the fort. This signal victory of an adherent of

¹ In the evening of 19 February, 1434 (9 Rajjab, 837 H). T.M.S., 236; T.A., I, 288.

² T.M.S., 236. ³ *Ibid.*, 238; T.A., I, 288.

⁴ T.M.S., 236-37; T.A., I, 288; Ferishta, I, 169; Badaoni, I, 300.

⁵ T.A., I, 288.

⁶ T.M.S., 238; so also Badaoni. Ferishta, I, 169 has "Rānū, a slave of the Vazīr". T.A., I, 288 has "Abū Shāh, his slave."

⁷ Ferishta, I, 169 has Samana, which seems to be wrong as Yahyā and others are emphatic about Bayana. T.M.S., 238; Badaoni, I, 300.

Mubārak Shāh together with the excesses of Sarwarul Mulk at Delhi in murdering many Amīrs whom he had earlier imprisoned, encouraged the loyal nobles⁹ to unfurl the standard of revolt. Malik Allahadād Kālā Lodi, governor of Sambhal and Ahar,¹⁰ Miyān Chaman, Amīr of Badaon and grandson of the late Khan-i-Jahān; Amīr 'Alī Gujarati and Amīr Gangū¹¹ Turkbachchā rose in rebellion.

Sarwarul Mulk deputed Kamālul Mulk, Saiyyad Khan son of Saiyyad Sālim, and Sadhāran to bring the rebels to book,¹² but he also sent his own ■■■ Malik Yūsuf to keep a watch on Kamālul Mulk. Why the Vazīr sent Kamālul Mulk at the head of the expedition is not difficult to guess. Firstly, it was to keep him as far away from Delhi as possible and secondly, to keep him busy fighting and give him ■■■ time to counter his (the Vazīr's) moves. But the Vazīr had miscalculated. The shrewd Kamālul Mulk was bent upon avenging the murder of the late Sultan, and distance from Delhi just suited his plans. He marched out in April, 1434 (Ramzān) and crossing the Jumna at the ford of Kichchā arrived at Baran. There he entered into secret negotiations with the rebellious Amīrs and invited Maliks Allahadād and Chaman to join him.¹³ This unnerved Yūsuf and he with Sadhāran and Hoshiyār, another creature of the Vazīr sent as ■■■ spy, escaped to Delhi to report on the situation. At this Kamālul Mulk decided to force the issue with the Vazīr. With Malik Allahadād and Miyān Chaman he recrossed the Jumna at Kichchā¹⁴ on Wednesday, 12 May, 1434

⁹ T.A., I, 288; Ferishta, I, 169 has one hundred noblemen.

¹⁰ ■■■ miles N.E. of Bulandshahr, U.P.

¹¹ T.M.S., 239 has كيك (Kik) and Ms M has كیکو (Kikū). Ferishta has كیکو (Kanku) while T.A., ■■■ کانکو (Kātkū). كیک ■■■ a mistaken reading for كیکو.

■ the dots in كیکو ■■■ put above ■■■ will read the correct name Gangū.

Badaoni does not give the ■■■. ■ and D, IV, 81 has Malik Kambal.

¹² T.M.S., 239.

¹³ Ibid., 240; T.A., I, 289.

¹⁴ On p. 239 of T.M.S. line 2 from below Yahyā writes, درگاه لب آب جون, that is, on his expedition Kamālul Mulk crossed the Jumna at Kichchā, which is correct as the ford of Kichchā lies on the Jumna. On his way back Kamālul Mulk again crossed the river Jumna ■■■ Kichchā.

T.M.S., 240 line 7-6 from below. کوچ متواتر دوم ماء شوال در گذر کبیر آمد. In E and D, IV, 82, the passage ■■■ mistakenly translated thus: "He crossed

(2 Shawwāl, 837 H) and encamped in the orchards on the Jumna.¹⁴ Sarwarul Mulk closed the gates of Sirī¹⁵ and prepared for a siege. Hoshiyār even made a sally but failed, and Malik Kamāl, whose forces had by now greatly swelled by the arrival of Amirs and Malikis of the surrounding country, began besieging the fort. The siege went on for three months from Shawwāl to Zilhijā after which Kamāluddīn was invited into the fort under dramatic circumstances.

Sultan Muhammad and Sarwarul Mulk had stood the siege well, but the Vazīr and his confederates were apprehensive of the Sultan's desertion to the enemy. Muhammad Shāh, too, contemplated revenge against the regicide Vazīr. In this atmosphere of mutual suspicion Sarwarul Mulk, who had succeeded in killing one Sultan, now tried his hand on the other. On 14 August, 1438 (8 Muharram, 838 H)¹⁶ he, along with the sons of Mirān Sadr, broke into the royal chamber to do away with the King, but Muhammad, who was ever on the alert and was always accompanied by a large body of armed attendants, drew his sword and struck down Sarwarul Mulk. The sons of Mirān Sadr were also done to death by the guards. The Sultan immediately summoned Kamālul Mulk and the latter entered the city with his army through the Baghdād Gate. Sadhāran and other Khattī accomplices of Sarwar were led off to the tomb of Mubārak Shāh and there tortured to death, while Hoshiyār and Mubārak, the Kotwal, were decapitated in front of the Red Gate.¹⁷

The next day a new government was formed. Yahyā even mentions a second coronation of Muhammad.¹⁸ In the new Honours-List Malik Kamālul Mulk got the office of Vazīrat and the title of Kamāl Khan. Malik Chaman got the title of Ghāzīul-

(the Ganges) at the ford of Kichā¹⁹. Unwittingly Basu also copies out these very words in his translation of the T.M.S. Basu's trs., 248. Yahyā nowhere places Kichchā on the Ganga — it did not exist there. Ni'amatulla spells it Kanjā but then places it rightly on the Jumna. So does Badaonī, text I, 276, 301, 509; Ranking, I, 364, 396, 406.

¹⁴ Badaonī, I, 301 has باغ حرد which means orchards on the Jumna, Jūd being a misreading for جرن or Jumna.

¹⁵ T.M.S., 241; Badaonī, I, 302; Ferishta, I, 170; T.A., I, 289.

¹⁶ T.M.S., 241; Badaonī, I, 301. Ferishta, I, 170, has 840 H.

¹⁷ T.M.S., 242; Ferishta, I, 170. ¹⁸ T.M.S., 242; also T.A., I, 290.

Mulk and was confirmed in his fiefs of Amroha and Badaon. Malik Allahadād refused any honour for himself, but obtained the title of Dariyā Khan for his younger brother¹⁹ who succeeded him in Sambhal. Malik Kahunrāj Mubārak Khan²⁰ continued in his possession of Hisār Firōzā and was entitled Iqbāl Khan. Malik Hājī ■■■ entitled Hisām Khan²¹ and ■■■ made Kotwal of the capital. The sons of the late Saiyyad Sālim of Bhatinda were given high titles. All loyal Amīrs and Maliks who had held offices and fiefs were either promoted or confirmed in their possessions.²²

A little after his ascension to real power the Sultan proceeded to Multan on a pilgrimage. There he learnt that Jasrat Khokhar²³ was creating trouble. He returned to Samana in A. D. 1436 from where he sent ■■■ army which sacked the country of the rebel. But on his return to Delhi he completely immersed himself in pleasure²⁴ despite threats from many quarters. Trouble was brewing in Sarhind as a consequence of which a new star was rising there. This star was Bahlūl Lodī. It has been noted that during the reign of Mubārak Shāh, Islām Khan Lodī, the governor of Sarhind, who had become a power in the Punjab, had been killed fighting Shaikh 'Alī of Kabul in May, 1431. He ■■■ succeeded by his nephew Bahlūl. Why Islām Khan had nominated Bahlūl in preference to his ■■■ will be studied later, but his accession to governorship excited the jealousy of Islām Khan's son Qutb Khan, who sought the intervention of Sultan Muhammad, pleading that Bahlūl was

¹⁹ Only one MS. of T.A. has برادر خود or his younger brother. The texts of T.A., Badaoni and Ferishta all have only برادر his brother. T.A., De, 326 n.

²⁰ The name is not at all clear. T.A. has گهراج مبارک خان. Ferishta has گهراج مبارک خان. Badaoni does not give the name.

²¹ T.M.S., 243 has ملاک القری حاجی شُدنی. M.R., I, 434 and T.A., I, 395 give his name Hājī Shudnī, as well as his title Hisām Khan. Badaoni does not give the name. Ferishta, I, 174, 176 has حاجی حیدر الشہر عمام خان.

We come across Hisām Khan quite often in later years and the Mallku) Sharq Hājī Shudnī of Yahyā is no other person than Hisām Khan. This is confirmed by Ni'amatulla, Dorn, 43.

For a discussion on the variants of the name see T.A., De, I, 332 n. 3. Ahmed Yildgār (T.S.A., 4) says that he was Nalb-i-Hazrat ■■■ the Deputy Sultan.

Hājī Shudnī (or correctly na-shudnī) is but a ■■■ of contempt.

²² T.M.S., 242-43.

²³ Ferishta, I, 170.

²⁴ Ibid., I, 170.

turning Sarhind into an Afghan stronghold.²⁵ The Sultan who did not want to forgo an opportunity furnished by disaffection among the Afghans to curb their rising strength, ordered Malik Sikandar Tuhfā to march to chastise Bahlūl. Sikandar sought the friendship of Jasrath Khokhar against Bahlūl who, unable to face their combined forces, retired to the Siwalik foot-hills (Kohistān). But Sikandar's atrocities on the Afghans made Qutb Khan feel ashamed of having appealed to Delhi. He and his uncle Firōz, whose son Shahrin had been killed in the fight against the royalists, joined Bahlūl. The latter turned a free-booter and with his gains from plunder built up a strong force. He reoccupied Sarhind and became a menace to the royal districts in its environs.²⁶ Sultan Muhammad despatched another force under Hisām Khan, the Kotwal and Deputy Sultan,²⁷ to chastise Bahlūl, but the latter met him with 500 horse near the village of Kharar in Ambala district, defeated and pushed him back to Delhi.²⁸ This victory enhanced Bahlūl's prestige and ambition, but for the time being he acted with cautious slyness. He sent a note to Sultan Muhammad giving a long account of "Hisām Khan's ill-behaviour and depravity, together with assurances of his own sincere attachment to the Sultan".²⁹ He ended by promising to attend the court at Delhi — the condition that his arch-enemy Hisām Khan should be put to death and Hamīd Khan be made the Vazīr. The fickle-minded Sultan, unable to see Bahlūl's guile and determined to purchase the Afghan's loyalty at any price, ordered Hisām Khan's death and raised Hamīd Khan to the Vazārat.³⁰

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 173.

²⁶ *Ferishta*, I, 173-4. These details are not given by any other historian.

²⁷ T.S.A., 4, 3.

²⁸ T.A., I, 295, has Kehra, T.D., 6, has Mānzil Kehdhīrā (لہ-۴۵). *Ferishta* has Khada, while T.S.A., 4, does not give the name of the village. *Mahāzan* has Garha, 40 (b). But all chronicles place it in the Pargana of Khizrābād and Sadhora (*Ferishta* — Shahpur).

The text of T.A. from which all others got the name has Kharra ۱۶. This is probably Kharār, now in Ambala district. There is a Khizrābād in Kharār Tehsil, seven miles south of Rūpar. Constable, 25, Bb.

Sadhora is 30 miles N.E. of Thanesar in Ambala district.

²⁹ Ahmad Yādgār wrongly says that Hisām Khan was killed in the battle. T.S.A., 5.

³⁰ *Mahāzan*, 31(a); Dorn, 44; *Ferishta*, I, 174.

From the character of Muhammad as it unfolds itself and which runs counter to the encomiums showered upon him by the author of the *Tarikh-i-Mubārak Shāhi*,²¹ it becomes patent enough that he abused the confidence of those who had saved him from his enemies. At the capital the reckless behaviour of the Sultan in destroying a loyal Vazīr shook the confidence of the nobles in him. Besides, his indolence and carelessness were encouraging ambitious elements to defy his authority. The Doab, always refractory, once again got out of control. In the south Gwalior ceased to pay even the periodical tribute²² and the turbulent Mewatis began to plunder the country within a short distance of the city-wall. In the east Ibrāhīm Sharqī took possession of many royal parganas. Beyond Panipat, to the north and west, Bahlūl Lodi — gathering strength day by day. In Multan the Langāhs,²³ an Afghan tribe recently settled there, rebelled against the royal governor in A. D. 1437 (841 H).²⁴

In such critical times the nobles of Delhi refused to pity the "king who was content to loiter in his palace while his kingdom dissolved". They decided to set matters right. They, together with the Khanzādās of Mewat, who were the ancestors of Hasan Khan Mewatī, invited Sultan Mahmūd Khajī of Malwa to ascend the throne of Delhi.²⁵ In pursuance of this tempting invitation Mahmūd Khajī started for Delhi in A. D. 1440 (844 H).²⁶ On the way he was joined by Yūsuf Hindwī of Hindwān. Establishing his power in Nāgor, Hansī and Hisār Firōzā,²⁷ he arrived in Delhi late in the year, and encamped at a distance of only two kos from the city.²⁸

Sultan Muhammad at last woke up to the situation, collected whatever troops he could gather and sent hurried summons to Bahlūl Lodi to come to his aid. Bahlūl responded readily, although not so much on account of any loyalty to the King as to strengthen his position in the country's politics, and arrived with twenty

²¹ T.M.S., I, 291.

²² T.A., I, 291.

²³ Badaoni and Nisā'uddīn call them, — Ferishta calls them Lunga. Ranking has "the tribe of Langāhs" while Briggs has "the Afghans called Lunga". Badaoni, I, 303; Ranking, I, 398; T.A., I, 291; Ferishta, I, 174.

²⁴ T.A., I, 291.

²⁵ Badaoni, I, 303; Ranking, I, 398.

²⁶ Ferishta, I, 171. Also T.A., I, 291; Badaoni, I, 303.

²⁷ Dorn, 44.

²⁸ Ferishta, I, 171; II, 264.

thousand Afghans.³⁹ In spite of this succour, Muhammad could not gather sufficient courage to lead the army in person, and only sent his ■■■ 'Alāuddīn at the head of the army making Bahlūl Lodi the commander of the vanguard.⁴⁰ When Mahmūd Khaljī learnt that Sultan Muhammad himself ■■■ not coming to fight, he also thought it below his dignity to join the battle and sent his army under his two sons Ghayāsuddīn and Qadr Khan.⁴¹ Next day a fierce battle raged between the rival forces, ■ which the Afghan archers of Bahlūl did a lot of killing, but they failed to gain a decisive victory. As night fell the fighting ceased. A bad dream that night⁴² that a local insurrection threatened his capital as well ■ an inkling that Ahmad Shāh of Gujarat⁴³ was coming to invade Mandu,⁴⁴ ■ much distressed Mahmūd that he thought ■ best to patch up ■ truce and return to Malwa. But while self-respect made him hesitate,⁴⁵ to the utter surprise and disgust of Delhi, Sultan Muhammad himself came out with an offer of peace. Mahmūd naturally responded readily and he struck tents. Bahlūl Lodi was highly chagrined; he made amends for the humiliating treaty by treacherously attacking Mahmūd Khaljī on his return march, killing a large number of his men and capturing some baggage and treasure.⁴⁶ The vacillating Sultan became exceedingly pleased even with this act of Bahlūl. He addressed him as his son, gave him the title of Khan-i-Khānān and sent him back to Sarhind with all honours.

Bahlūl Lodi went on gathering strength at Sarhind. The prophecy of Shaikh Sadrūddīn,⁴⁷ his own military talents as well ■

³⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 171, 174.

⁴⁰ T.A., I, 291; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 398; Ferishta, I, 171; II, 264.

⁴¹ Nizāmuddīn has Qadan Khan (قادر خان) and Badaoni Medan Khan (مدان خان). Ferishta's Qadr Khan seems to be correct.

⁴² Ferishta, II, 264. T.A., Do, III, 509.

⁴³ We learn from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* that between A. D. 1432 and 1442 not a year passed when Sultan Ahmad ■■ Gujarat did not send his army to chastise one or the other of his enemies, and ■ the Sultan of Malwa ■ one of his worst foes. Bayley, *Gujarat*, 112, 114; Commissariat, I, 89-90.

⁴⁴ Ferishta, II, 265. T.A., I, 291.

⁴⁵ Ferishta, I, 171.

⁴⁶ Dorn, 44.

⁴⁷ Almost all chroniclers say that one day Bahlūl went to Samana with his two companions Qutb Khan and Firōz Khan. There they visited a Darwāsh by the name of Saiyyad Ibn Majzīb. The saint was known to be

the utter incapacity of the Saiyyad monarch encouraged Bahlūl to seize with impunity a number of royal districts including Deopulpur, Lahore, Sunām and Hisār, and he paid no heed to Sultan Muhammad's protests.⁴⁶ The Sultan was completely demoralised and felt so helpless that when in A. D. 1441 (845 H)⁴⁷ Jasrat Khokhar again rose in rebellion, he confirmed Deopulpur and Lahore on Bahlūl Lodi⁴⁸ as a price for chastising Jasrat. Jasrat knew the strength of his adversary; he entered into a compact with Bahlūl who promised not to invade his homeland provided Jasrat also did not interfere with his designs on Delhi.

Jasrat's hectic career came to a close with his death in 1442. This indefatigable warrior had fought against the Sultanate for more than two decades, and his career needs summing up. He had fought against Timur when the latter had invaded India. Having failed against him, he helped his father Shaikha in occupying Lahore under the very banner of the terrible conqueror. He was carried away as a prisoner to Samarcand. These privations must have steelled his character and made him a staunch enemy of the Sultanate through whose incompetence he had had to suffer so much. When, therefore, he returned and found the Sultanate weak, he struck against it. He fought it for twenty years continually and must have grown

a *Sāhib-i-Laft*; and it was believed that whatever passed his lips used to come out true. On seeing Bahlūl and his companions the holy man asked: "Who amongst you would like to buy the kingdom of Delhi for two thousand *tanakas*?" Malik Bahlūl had only 1,300 *tanakas* with him and placed the amount before the saint. The latter took the money and congratulated Bahlūl by saying, "May the Bādshāh be auspicious to you". When they left the place, Bahlūl's companions laughed at him for his loss of money. Bahlūl quietly told them that if the prophecy came out to be true he had made a wonderful bargain, and if not, the service to a Darwāsh was not devoid of profit. Also T.D., 3-4.

The name of the saint is uncertain. He is called Saiyyad Ibn by Nizāmuddin and Nizamutulla (T.A., I, 295; *Makhzan*, 40 (b)—41 (a); also M.R., I, 434). Shāids by Farišta, I, 174. Fata by Ahmad Yādgar (T.S.A., 3) and Seid Ayan by Dorn, 43. According to a legend still current in Ludhiana, his name was Shaikh Sadr-i-Jahān or Sadruddin, and he was a disciple of Shaikh Bihāuddin Zakariya of Multan. The Nawabs of Maler Kotla claim direct descent from him and his mausoleum is shown in Maler. J.A.S.B., 1869, Pt. I, 92; I.G. XVII, 86; Hodivala, 491.

⁴⁶ Dorn, 44.

⁴⁷ T.A., I, 291; *Badshahi*, I, 304; Farišta, I, 171.

⁴⁸ T.A., I, 291-92.

grey in the act. His body had failed him, but his animus towards Delhi remained undiminished till the end, ■ much so, that he bequeathed his task to Bahlūl Lodī. Jasrat was a brave warrior, though a reckless adventurer. Men of his kind abounded in fifteenth century India.

The temptation of kingship ■ too strong for Bahlūl to resist. In 1443-44 he marched with a strong army to Delhi and invested it.⁵¹ The siege went ■ for a considerable time, but the fort being strong, Bahlūl returned to Sarhind without accomplishing much. On his return, however, he assumed the title of Sultan, abstaining for the time being from having the Khutba read or the coins struck in his name.⁵² The contagion of Sarhind spread as ■ as twenty *kos* from Delhi; the Amirs and chieftains openly declared their independence and the Sultan could do nothing. Amidst such a hopeless situation Muhammad Shāh died in A.D. 1445 (849 H) after a reign of a little over twelve years.⁵³

⁵¹ Badaoni, I, 304; T.A., I, 296; Ferishta, I, 174.

⁵² *Makhzan*, 41 (b); Ferishta, I, 174.

⁵³ *Makhzan*, 41 (b) and Dorn, 44 do not give the date, but describing the events chronologically place his death here.

A little difficulty has been experienced in deciding upon the year of Sultan Muhammad's death owing to the conflicting dates given by various historians. Nizāmuddin clearly says: "At length, in ■ year 847 H (A.D. 1443), Sultan Muhammad Shāh died", but then wrongly adds "After ■ reign of ten years and some months". (T.A., I, 292 and De's trans., 329 n. 2). We know, ■ Yahyā's authority, that Muhammad Shāh ascended the throne on 9 Rajjab, 837 H (T.M.S., 236). Ferishta also clearly has 837 H ■ the year of Muhammad's accession and 849 ■ as that of his death (Ferishta, I, 169, 171). He also adds that Muhammad Shāh reigned for twelve years and some months (*Ibid.*, 171). Badaoni also has 847 H ■ the year of Muhammad's death, but he credits him with a reign of fourteen years and some months (Badaoni, I, 300, 304) which is manifestly wrong.

As Prof. Hodivala suggests, these discrepancies in the MSS. are due to the bewildering similarity between سبع و أربع and تسع in the semitic script (Hodivala, 410). Col. Ranking was ■ favour of 849 H, the date given by Ferishta, ■ the ground that it was "plain and coincident" (Badaoni, Ranking, I, 399-400 note).

Numismatic evidence also supports Ferishta's dates as Muhammad Shāh's. Bilon and copper coins of every year from 837 to 849 H are known (J.A.S.B., 1921, Numismatic supplement XXXV; N. Wright, 236, 241). Thomas was inclined to agree with 847 H (*Chronicles*, 336 n.) but the coins of Muhammad Shāh after the year of 847 H were not available to him. Therefore, 849 H

'Ālam Shāh

After the death of Muhammad Shāh, his son succeeded peacefully to the throne with the title of Sultan 'Alāuddīn 'Ālam Shāh, in accordance with the testamentary disposition of his father⁴⁴ and the concurrence of the nobility.⁴⁵ Shāh 'Ālam signalled the event by issuing coins,⁴⁶ and all and sundry did him homage.⁴⁷ In those troubled times no king could have got such an easy succession to the throne, without any opposition whatsoever, but unfortunately 'Alāuddīn lacked acquaintance with the affairs of the state and within a short time proved himself to be even less intelligent and more vacillating than his father.⁴⁸ A pleasure seeker by temperament, he found kingship a difficult office. Sincere advice used to sting him, while the pursuit of pleasure was all that he thought life worth for.

There was yet another reason why kingship had no charm for him. At the time of his accession the Sultanate had shrunk to its narrowest limits. Not only Gujarat, Malwa, and Jaunpur had surpassed it in strength and Bahāḡ Lodi ruled over the whole of the Punjab as far east as Panipat,⁴⁹ but even the districts around Delhi were in the hands of certain tribal chiefs, mostly Afghan. The tract from Maholi near Mathura up to Sarai Lado in the vicinity of Delhi, was in the hands of Ahmad Khan Mewati,⁵⁰ while on the

as the date of Muhammad Shāh's death is correct and he ruled for a little over twelve years.

⁴⁴ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 400 T.A., I, 292.

⁴⁵ T.A., I, 292.

⁴⁶ A silver coin weighing 175 grains gives his full name as well as title as سلطان علاؤالدین و آلین شاه بن محمد شاه بن فرید شاه (Sultan Alāudduniya-va-uddīn 'Ālam Shāh bin Muhammad Shāh bin Farid Shāh). J.(P.)A.S.B. New Series, XI, 1915, 483; Thomas, *Chronicles*, 338, 339. Also see Nelson Wright, Plate XI, 920.

⁴⁷ T.A., I, 292; Badaoni, I, 305. Only Farišta, I, 171 (line 2 from below) says that Bahāḡ did not pay homage to the new king.

⁴⁸ T.A., I, 292, 297-98.

⁴⁹ T.A., I, 296; Farišta, I, 174.

⁵⁰ Nizāmuddīn, Ni'amatulla and Farišta have Mahrauli. A. Pandey accepts it (*First Afghan Empire in India*, 52 and n.). Mahrauli lies only 11 miles distant from Delhi on the Delhi-Gurgaon Road and it would be funny to mention a tract of eight miles from Mahrauli to Sarai Lado as of any consequence. Besides all historians mention the region of Mewat. In all probability the place is Maholi near Mathura. It was a Mahal in Sarkar

western side of the Jumna the tract from Sambhal up to the ford of Khwājā Khizr (through which Tīmūr had crossed into Delhi near Wazīrābād) was in the possession of Dariyā Khan Lodī so that their authority extended up to the capital from opposite directions. Kol was occupied by 'Isā Khan Turkbachchā. In Rapri, Chandwār and Etawah Qutb Khan, son of Hasan Khan Afghan, held his sway. Bhongaon, Kampil and Patiali were with Rai Pratap Singh.⁶¹ Bayana was with Dāūd Khan Auhadī.⁶² Gwalior and Dholpur had their own Rajas. The country being thus parcelled out,⁶³ the sultanate was shrunk to such an extent that a contemporary poet satirically declared: "The Empire of the Emperor of the World (Shāh 'Ālam) extended (only) from Delhi to (a distance of ten miles to) Palam".⁶⁴

If Shāh 'Ālam ~~was~~ not quite happy with his Empire, he had genuine reasons for being so. But even for the Sultan of this Sultanate from "Delhi to Palam" there was no peace. The neighbouring rulers wanted to derive the fullest advantage from the Sultanate grown so weak while Bahlūl, in whose mind "the egg of royalty was hatching", was more aggressive than ever before. In A.D. 1447 (851 H) he once again marched to Delhi, invested Sīrī, and went back only at the intercession of Qutb Khan Lodī and Rai Pratap Singh.⁶⁵ The Sultan's nerves were greatly strained under the stress of this invasion and he went to Badaon for a change. The climate of the place had a spell on him, and he developed a deep desire to stay there. 'Alāuddīn had neither the capacity nor the inclination to rule, and he finally left for Badaon in A.D. 1448 (852 H) leaving Agra, Sūba Agra (Āin. tra., II, 183; Elliot, *Races*, II, 85-86). Its ruler Ahmad Khan Mewatī was a grandson of Bahādur Nāhar and paid his respects to Muhammad Shāh in 838 ■ (T.M.S., 243).

⁶¹ T.A., I, 297; Dorn, 44.

⁶² He ■ called Auhadī by Nizāmuddīn, Nizāmattulla and Ferishta. Erskine calls him Lodī, I, 403.

⁶³ T.A., I, 296-297; Ferishta, I, 172; *Makhzan*, 42 (a). T.S.A., 5 and T.D., 7 only refer to it. Badaoni does not give these divisions.

⁶⁴ T.D., 7; T.S.A., 5. شہنشاہی شہ عالم - از دہلی تا پالم. Palam, 10 miles south of Delhi, is ■ an international airport. During the time of Akbar it was a small pargana and was included in the Sarkar of Delhi. Āin., II, 286.

⁶⁵ *Makhzan* 42 (a); Also Thomas, *Chronicles*, 338. Other chroniclers do not make mention of their intercession.

the management of the government in the hands of his wife's two brothers one of whom he appointed as Shahnā-i-Shahr (Superintendent of the City) and the other as Mīr-i-Kuī (Superintendent of the Highways).⁶⁶ The existence of double courts—one at Delhi and the other at Badaon—disintegrated the Central Government. Worse still, the two brothers-in-law of the Sultan soon fell out at Delhi. One of them killed the other, and other was killed by the people in revenge for the first one.⁶⁷ 'Ālam Shāh consulted 'Isā Khan, Qutb Khan and Rai Pratap "as to how he might re-establish his authority".⁶⁸ They promised to help him only on the condition that he would put Hamid Khan, the Vazir, to death, alleging that Hamid was in secret correspondence with Sultan Mahmūd of Mandu with a view to placing him on the throne.⁶⁹ 'Isā Khan and Qutb Khan hoped to gain if a strong Vazir like Hamid Khan was done to death, while Rai Pratap bore a personal grudge against him ■ Hamid's father, Fatēh Khan, had laid waste the Rai's territories and killed his old father. "Sultan 'Alāuddīn who had no acquaintance with the administration of an empire, gave the orders for the death of Hamid Khan without deliberation or delay".⁷⁰ But Hamid proved too smart for him. He collected his friends and supporters, occupied the fort of Sirī, captured the royal treasure and turned out the members of the royal family, including the ladies, with great insult.⁷¹

Hamid was ■ securely entrenched in Delhi. But he thought it discreet not to assume the regal title. Instead, he decided to place a monarch on the vacant throne. He thought of Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī of Jaunpur but, ■ he was the brother-in-law of Sultan 'Alāuddīn, he could not be relied upon. Sultan Mahmūd of Malwa, who was connected with the old Khaljī house of Delhi, was also dropped because he was placed too distant to be invited.⁷² Moreover, both of them were strong and ambitious monarchs and would

⁶⁶ T.A., I, 293; Ferishta, I, 172; Badaoni, Ranking, 407. Also Z.W., III, 920, wherein it says that one was made governor of the city and other of the environs.

⁶⁷ T.A., I, 293. ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 297.

⁶⁹ T.D., 6; T.S.A., 6. According ■ Ferishta, I, 172, they made such allegations to weaken the King. ■ ■ argument is hardly tenable.

⁷⁰ T.A., I, 297; Do's trs., 336. ⁷¹ Ferishta, I, 172; Dorn, 45.

⁷² Ahmad Yādgar says that he had only two persons in view, one Bahlūl Khan and the other Sultan Mahmūd of Mandu. T.S.A., 6.

not have acted as showboys for Hamid.⁷³ While Hamid was thus meditating on a good choice Bahlul Lodi, who had all along been watching the developments at Delhi with keen interest, marched with his army and besieged it in A.D. 1450 (854 H).⁷⁴ Unable to face him Hamid entered into a compact with Bahlul, made him the king and himself the Vazir, but kept to himself all authority and power.⁷⁵

Hamid had calculated wrongly. The Afghans had already spread out into the Punjab and Uttar Pradesh. They only needed to gain some ~~more~~ strength to become rulers of Hindustan. Bahlul knew this, but he was also aware of the fact that because of their shifting loyalties and intriguing nature the Delhi nobility could not be depended upon. He therefore sent an appeal to his home country Roh, in eastern Afghanistan,⁷⁶ and invited his "brethren" to help him secure his position. He promised their leaders large jagirs and equal status, and the Afghans of Roh began their trek into Hindustan in ever larger numbers like "ants and locusts".

Meanwhile the shrewd Bahlul continued to treat Hamid Khan with all possible courtesy,⁷⁷ although he had made up his mind to do away with the Vazir. He used to call on Hamid every day, always keeping near his person his own Afghan followers from Roh.⁷⁸ One day when Hamid Khan had invited Bahlul to dinner, the latter went with a large following and ~~was~~ seated them that two or three Afghans sat close to every man of Hamid Khan. When the dinner was over, Bahlul's cousin Qutb Khan Lodi, drew out a chain from under his arm and throwing it before Hamid said, "The best thing for you will be to retire from public life. As ~~I~~ have eaten your salt, I do not intend to put you to death".⁷⁹ Hamid was taken by surprise, but he was helpless. He and his men were overpowered. Hamid was probably put to death soon after for he is not heard of any more.

Having removed Hamid from the political arena, Bahlul moved with utmost tact to gain the confidence and support of the Delhi

⁷³ Farihta, I, 172.

⁷⁴ Dorn, 45.

⁷⁵ W.M., 2 (b).

⁷⁶ For Roh ~~see~~ Appendix C.

~~see~~ I.D., 8.

~~see~~ *Makhzan*, 43 (a).

⁷⁷ T.S.A., 8; *Makhzan*, 43 (b); Dorn, 46; I.D., 10. Rizqulla says that Hamid Khan ~~was~~ told that his treachery to 'Almuddin had rendered him unworthy of the office. W.M., 3 (a).

nobility. By his extreme generosity he was soon able to win them over to his side.²⁰ Thereupon he wrote to Sultan 'Alāuddīn thus: "Since I was brought up through the kindness of your father, I have put the ungrateful Hamid in chains. I consider myself your regent for this country, and am ready to secure to you the empire which was wrested from your hands. Nor will I prevent the Khutba from being read in your name". 'Alāuddīn wrote back: "Since my father addressed you ■ son, ■ consider you as my elder brother, I have therefore made over the government to you and have contented myself with the pargana of Badaon. Would to God the Sultanate of Delhi might prosper under you".²¹ 'Alāuddīn's reply exhilarated Bahlūl. He held a coronation Darbār and ascended the throne ■ 19 April, 1451 (17 Rabiul Avval, 855 H)²² with the title of Sultan Abul Muzaffar Bahlūl Ghāzi.²³

'Alāuddīn 'Ālam Shāh continued to live at Badaon. Such a peaceful transfer of power ■ unique in the annals of Medieval India. Sir Wolsley Haig treats 'Alāuddīn harshly by saying: "The contemptible 'Ālam Shāh remained contentedly at Badaon, where the revenue of the small territory which he had been permitted to retain sufficed to defray the cost of his pleasures".²⁴ Dr. Ishwari Prasad is equally uncharitable when he writes: "The imbecile 'Alāuddīn lived out the remnant of his life, perhaps without any pangs of regret or sense of humiliation, in undisturbed repose at Badaon".²⁵ In 'Alāuddīn one should not try to find an imbecile or a contemptible monarch, but ■ true Saiyyad not only in calling but also in temperament. Badaoni faithfully expresses the sentiments of 'Ālam Shāh in one of his letters to Bahlūl. It reads: "There is neither fruit nor profit for ■ in sovereignty; living in solitary contentment at Badaon, ■ resign the empire of Delhi to you".²⁶

■ T.S.A., ■.

²⁰ *Makhzan*, 44 (a); Dorn, 46-7. Ahmad Yādgar also gives the contents of both the letters. T.S.A., 9.

²¹ T.A., I, 298; *Makhzan* ■ (b); *Ferishta*, I, 173; Dorn, 47; M.R., I, 437, 440. Badaoni, I, 306 gives the year only. T.S.A., 10 and T.D., 11-12 give 27 instead of 17 as the date of accession.

²² T.S.A., 10; T.D., 11.

²³ C.H.I., III, 227.

²⁴ *Medieval India*, 468. Cf. also Dr. R. P. Tripathi, *Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire*, 21.

²⁵ Badaoni, I, 306; Ranking, I, 401.

Indeed the peace-loving Sultan had got fed up with the all-round confusion. While all and sundry were trying to gain the most from the prevailing confusion, here was a monarch who willingly renounced what was not in his power to manage. To be able to rule successfully in those days needed all the tact, nay the cunning, of a medieval despot. 'Alāuddīn does not ~~seem~~ to have possessed it. If he was not a man of saintly temperament, he was certainly a man of a quiet and peaceful disposition. For more than two decades his predecessors had unwittingly transferred large assignments to the Afghans for securing their help in solving the problems of the state. The Afghans had gradually established their power both in the west and east of Delhi and one day they were bound to try for the throne. Sultan 'Alāuddīn only paid for the mistakes of his predecessors. The Sultanate he must necessarily have lost, for the powerful Bahlūl had set his heart upon it, and seen in this context, 'Ālam Shāh was a gainer in getting Badaon at least. No one could appreciate his nature and position better than his contemporaries. Ambitious rulers of Delhi and Jaunpur not only did not consider him a thorn in their side, but respected him and left him undisturbed to rule in Badaon for twenty-eight long years. Moreover, except for renouncing the honour of being called the Sultan of Delhi, 'Ālam Shāh had not lost much, for his kingdom was in no way less in territory than the "empire of Delhi to Palam" which he had relinquished. 'Ālam Shāh's little kingdom consisted of "Badaon and the districts appertaining to it, towards the river Ganga as far as Khairābād and the foot of the hills, and he used to read the Khutba in his own name in those districts"⁸⁷ for the next twenty-eight years till his death in A.D. 1478 (883 H.).⁸⁸

The Saiyyad Dynasty

'Ālam Shāh's abdication brought to an end the rule of the Saiyyad dynasty. It had ruled for thirty-seven years. Of its four rulers, Khizr Khan was the first and the greatest. His accession had reunited the Punjab to the Sultanate of Delhi. But while his kindness,

⁸⁷ Badaoni, I, 306; Ranking, I, 402.

⁸⁸ Ferishta, I, 173. Badaoni wrongly has 855 H. That was the year of Bahlūl's accession, not of 'Alāuddīn's death.

which did not treat recalcitrants as rebels, endeared him to all, it encouraged many to rise against him. The extent of rebelliousness during his reign and after can be gauged from the fact that only military expeditions could collect the yearly tribute from as nearby regions as Katehar in the north-east, Mewat in the south and Etawah in the east of Delhi. "There were, of course, the ordinary concessions to expediency . . . submission for the moment in the presence of a superior force . . . ■ desertions of fields and strongholds easily regained ; but there was clearly no material advance in public security or in the supremacy of the Central government".²⁹

Mubarak Saiyyad showed determination by freely using the title of the Sultan, effecting constant transfers, fighting rebels and invaders and marching against the kings of Jaunpur and Malwa, but behind this imposing facade lay the hard fact that throughout his reign of thirteen years the Punjab was constantly harried by rebels and invaders and the east could not be brought under control. In dealing with the problems of the Punjab, Mubarak Shāh continued the policy of his predecessor, of giving high civil and military assignments to Afghan nobles. Sarhind had been bestowed upon Sultan Shāh Lodi by Khizr Khan (A.D. 1419). Mubarak Shāh gave Lahore and Jalandhar to Malik Kālā Lodi (1432) and later on he ■ made governor of Sambhal and Ahar. Similarly many other large and small provinces passed into the hands of the Afghans so much so that during the last years of the Saiyyad rule the whole of the Punjab and the western U.P. was controlled by them. Thus because of the necessity of fighting the rebels, Khizr Khan and Mubarak Khan had mortgaged the Punjab to the Afghans, particularly the Lodis. They had fought ■ evil with another, for while the rebels were disloyal the Afghans looked only to their personal gain. The first two Saiyyads had unconsciously helped in the rise of the Lodi power at the expense of their own dynasty.

During Muhammad Saiyyad's eleven years of misrule, the king of Jaunpur annexed many eastern districts belonging to the Delhi Sultanate, Gwalior became completely independent, Mewat got out of control, and the Punjab was lost to the Afghans. Muhammad Shāh tried to crush Bahlūl Lodi, but he found himself completely helpless. We shall study about the power and politics

²⁹ Thomas, *Chronicles*, 327.

of the kingdoms of Malwa and Gujarat in their proper perspective. Suffice it here to say that after the invasion of Tīmūr they had become independent of the Sultanate of Delhi. Mahmūd Khalji I of Malwa was ambitious and energetic. By 1445-46 he had extended its frontiers up to Kalpi and had compelled the ruler of Bayana to read the Khutba in his name. The situation was so hopeless indeed that had Gujarat's pressure not threatened Mahmūd, he would probably have annexed Delhi to his kingdom. Thus when Muhammad Saiyyad died, no point on his frontier was more than forty miles distant from Delhi. Shāh 'Ālam could not hold this little kingdom not to say of augmenting it. He even became a butt of ridicule, and nobody perhaps shed tears when he eventually faded out of history.

In these circumstances the Saiyyads could make no positive contribution to kingship²⁰ to the system of civil administration, which had not been checked up or improved upon for the last fifty years. We hardly hear of any civil or revenue officials during this period and revenue could be collected only through military operations. During the last days of the Saiyyad rule, their kingdom disintegrated rapidly and even cities and districts became independent. Bahlūl, the first ruler of the Lodī dynasty, had to begin the process of empire building all afresh, to bring under his sway district after district and even to create a new theory of kingship.

²⁰ R. P. Tripathi, *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, 80.

Chapter 8

PRIMUS INTER PARES

Early Career of Bahlul Lodi

SULTAN BAHULUL LODI,¹ who ascended the throne of Delhi in 1451, rose to such eminence from a humble beginning. According to Ferishta, Bahlul's grand-father Behrām Lodi was ■■■ of the Afghan traders who used to come to Hindustan to sell their merchandise. Behrām had had some estrangement with his brother and he left his home country to settle down permanently in India during the reign of Firōz Tughlaq. He took up service under Malik Mardān Daulat, governor of Multan, whom ■■■ have met before. Behrām had five sons—Malik Sultan Shāh, Malik Kālā, Malik Firōz, Malik Muhammad and Malik Khwājā.² Sultan Shāh took up service under Khizr Khan, governor of Multan, and was put in charge of a contingent of Afghans. He actively helped Khizr Khan in his fight against Mallū Iqbāl Khan, and it was he who struck down Mallū Iqbāl in battle in 1405. For this act of bravery Khizr Khan rewarded him with the title of Islām Khan and the fief of Sarhind.³ As governor of Sarhind, Islām Khan assigned to his brothers many parganas under his control, and Malik Kālā Lodi was appointed to the pargana of Daurala.⁴ Malik Kālā had married one of his uncle's daughters. When she was in an advanced stage of pregnancy, she was crushed under a collapsing wall, but the child was rescued by a surgical operation.⁵ This child ■■■ Bahlul Lodi.

A short time after, Malik ■■■ died in a battle with the Niazis. The orphan Ballū (for that was Bahlul's pet name)⁶ was sent for by Islām Shāh to Sarhind to be brought up there. The lad was full of spirit and showed martial qualities. During Khizr Khan's rule, Bahlul brought many recalcitrant parganas under control and ■■■

¹ For the origin of the Lodis see Appendix C.

² Ferishta, I, 173-74.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 173; T.S.A., 2; T.D., Allahabad University MS., 3.

⁴ In Akbar's reign Daurala was included in Sarkar Sarhind. *Āin.*, II, 296.

⁵ Ferishta, I, 173.

⁶ T.D., 2, 3, 4, 5 and W.M., 2 (a) have Ballū. Ferishta, I, 173, has Mallū.

that account ■■■ rewarded with fiefs.⁷ Pleased with his talents, Islām Shāh married his daughter to him and began to favour him even ■■■ than his own sons.

There is no reason to believe that Bahlūl Lodi was engaged in trade in his youth as has been averred by 'Abdulla, the author of *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*.⁸ True, his grand-father was a merchant, but after Islām Khan had taken up service with Khizr Khan, all the sons of Behrām seem to have joined government service. Bahlūl was brought up by his uncle who took every care of him,⁹ and he hardly needed to take to trading for livelihood. This hypothesis is supported by the statements of Nizāmuddīn and Ni'āmatulla.¹⁰

Islām Khan served Khizr Khan loyally and was raised from the position of Malik to that of Khan. During Mubārak Saiyyad's rule his fame and importance continued to rise and he was given the titles of Malikul Sharq and Khan-i-Āzam.¹¹ In course of time Islām Khan, seeing marks of diligence and integrity in his nephew and son-in-law, put a contingent of twelve thousand Afghans under his charge.¹² And although he had a number of intelligent sons, he nominated Bahlūl ■■■ his successor.¹³ When in May, 1431, Islām Khan was killed fighting Shaikh 'Alī of Kabul, Bahlūl took possession of Sarhind.¹⁴ This was resented by Islām Khan's son Qutb Khan, who, as has been seen before, appealed to Sultan Muhammad Saiyyad to remove Bahlūl from Sarhind. But the helpless ruler of the weakened Sultanate could do little against him.

⁷ Ferishta, I, 173. ⁸ T.D., 4-5.

⁹ T.S.A., 1; T.D., 2; *Mahāzan*, 40 (a).

¹⁰ T.A., I, 295; Dorn, 45. Also M.R., I, 435. *Mahāzan*, 41 (a).

¹¹ T.M.S., 208-9, 216.

¹² Ferishta, I, 173.

¹³ Muhammad Kabir gives the following ■■■ for the choice of Bahlūl. He says ■■■ Islām Khan (whom he calls Jalāluddīn) had two wives, one Afghan and the other Rajput. From the first wife was born a daughter named Firdausi and from the second Qutb Khan. Firdausi was married to Bahlūl. A little before his death Islām Khan called ■■■ and Qutb Khan to his presence ■■■ addressing the latter said: "Bahlūl is born of an Afghan woman while you are the son of a Rajput. The Afghans are rustic. They will not obey you. I nominate Bahlūl as the king and you as his Vazir". So saying he took off his turban and placed it on the head of ■■■ *Afsān-i-Shāhān*, British Museum MS., 14 (b); Also tra. in Hindi in *Uttar Tīmūr Kāla Bharat*, I, 365.

¹⁴ *Mahāzan*, 41 (a); W.M., 2 (a).

Indeed, Bahlūl Lodī had gathered so much strength that Sultan Muhammad had to seek his help against the Khanzādās of Mewat and Mahmūd Khaljī of Malwa. By the time 'Alāuddīn 'Ālam Shāh Saiyyad ascended the throne, Bahlūl had become master of the whole of the Punjab. He was ■■■ slow to take advantage of the confusion prevailing in Delhi after 'Alāuddīn's departure for Badaon, and as seen above, by dealing with the Vazīr, Hamīd Khan, sternly and with Sultan 'Alāuddīn softly and tactfully, he ascended the throne on 19 April, 1451 (17 Rabiul Avval, 855 H), under the title of Sultan Abul Muzaffar Bahlūl Shāh Ghāzī.

With his accession the Sultanate of Delhi ceased to be the little kingdom extending from "Delhi to Palam". All the districts west of the capital—Panipat, Sarhind, Deopapur, Lahore, and their outlying regions—had automatically returned to the Sultanate. The strong chiefs around Delhi—many of whom ■■■ Afghans—were supporters of Bahlūl.¹⁵ Even so the elements pitted against him were so varied and so bitterly hostile that he had to fight them all through his life. It was not easy to remove the anti-Afghan sentiments from the breasts of men. The Turkish sultans had considered the Afghans to be good soldiers, and nothing more; they were devoid of "culture" and, therefore, the very idea of their becoming rulers was deemed to be outrageous. A similar wave of resentment had swept over Delhi when the Khaljis had succeeded the Ilbaris.¹⁶ Bahlūl had also to face problems posed by the demerits of his own Afghan followers. Their sentimental attachment to their queer ideas of unbridled freedom, and their traditional devotion to their tribal leaders, were not conducive to discipline and harmony. Besides this, there were the sympathisers of the Saiyyad ruler living at Badaon. His son-in-law, the King of Jaunpur, could ■■■ brook the idea of an alien occupying the throne which he thought belonged to him ■■ a matter of right. Other problems were no less important. Hindustan which had been broken up was to be reclaimed and consolidated. The authority of the crown, so badly shaken during the last years, had to be re-established.

To surmount these difficulties and ■■ steer his ship successfully, Bahlūl had to act with alertness and discretion. As a first step

¹⁵ Erskine, *Babur and Humayun*, I, 405.

¹⁶ T.F.S. (B), 173-75.

towards meeting his difficulties he gave all key-posts in the treasury, stores, and stables of elephants and horses to his trusted Afghan officers. He also bestowed important iqt'ās in and around Delhi on his loyal adherents.¹⁷ The fort itself was garrisoned by the pick of the Afghan soldiery. Ni'āmatulla and Ahmad Yādgar say that he even "freed of factious ■■■ some districts around Delhi,"¹⁸ which again goes to show that he wanted to "Afghanise" the administration and curb all disaffected elements.

For this purpose Bahlūl Lodi felt the need of enrolling many more Afghan troops and thought of marching to Multan,¹⁹ the chief centre of recruitment of Afghans from Roh. During the reign of Mubārak Shāh, Multan had suffered terribly because of the inroads of Shaikh 'Alī, but Mubārak and his incompetent successors had failed to restore peace there. Sick of the strife and discord, the elite of the city, in 1443 (847 H), raised to the throne Shaikh Yūsuf Qureshī, a descendant of Shaikh Bahauddīn Zakaria.²⁰ But the independence of Multan and Uchch had cut off the chief recruiting centre of Bahlūl and he, after leaving the capital in the hands of his ■■■ Khwājā Bayezīd, marched to Multan about the end of 1451.²¹ His aims were two; firstly, to bring that strategic region under control and secondly, to recruit fresh levies.²²

War with the Sharqīs

While Bahlūl was away, ■ section of the nobility at the capital, which was alarmed at Bahlūl's policy of Afghanisation, invited Mahmūd Sharqī of Jaunpur to occupy Delhi.²³ A warlike monarch like Mahmūd hardly needed ■ invitation. In the very year of his accession (A.D. 1440—844 H) he had issued a large pattern coin as

¹⁷ T.S.A., 8; Dorn, 47-8.

¹⁸ T.S.A., 20; *Mahsan*, 44 (a).

¹⁹ *Ferishta*, I, 175.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 324.

²¹ Ahmad Yādgar has Lahore in place of Multan. T.S.A., 20.

²² *Ferishta*, I, 175. Also T.A., I, 301. Sir Wolsley Haig (C.H.I., III, 229) and N. B. Roy (Ni'āmatulla's trs., xiii) say that Bahlūl went ■ reinstate Yūsuf Qureshī on the throne of Multan which Qutbuddīn Langāh had usurped. But they anticipate. As we shall see a little later Qutbuddīn Langāh ousted Yūsuf and occupied Multan not before A.D. 1454.

²³ T.A., I, 301; *Ferishta*, I, 175.

complete in inscription as that of any Delhi sovereign,²⁴ probably to symbolise his complete equality with the Sultan of Delhi. He and his predecessors had fought the Saiyyads of Delhi on many occasions and had married their daughters either through force or persuasion. Besides Mahmūd had fought many wars against Malwa.²⁵ Until the accession of Bahlūl, the kingdom of Jaunpur was a power to be reckoned with; now it was threatened by the ascendancy of the Afghans who, besides being masters of the Sultanate, dominated the whole of the Punjab and the Western Uttar Pradesh. Mahmūd's wife, a Saiyyad princess, was also nagging and instigating him to capture Delhi which, she pleaded, belonged to her forefathers and not to the upstart Bahlūl. She even threatened to lead a campaign in person if her husband delayed to march against Delhi.²⁶ Mahmūd also knew that Jaunpur was the only power which could champion the cause of the Saiyyads who had been ousted from the throne. Therefore, he could neither miss the opportunity of satisfying his ambition contained in the invitation from Delhi, nor fail to assert his right as envisaged by his wife.

In short, the Sharqī King arrived at Delhi in 1452 (856 H)²⁷ with a large force including a thousand elephants. The campaign was well planned: Bahlūl with his army was away in the west and Dariyā Khan Lodī, governor of Sambhal and a relative of Bahlūl, had been persuaded to join the Sharqī camp. Mahmūd placed Fatēh Khan Harwī, an important nobleman of Jaunpur,²⁸ and Dariyā Khan Lodī in charge of investing the fort, and they began the siege in full force. Khwājā Bayezīd and Bibi Matto,²⁹ Islām Khan's widow and mother-in-law of Bahlūl, had no option but to shut the gates and stand the siege. That brave lady dressed the women

²⁴ J.(P.)A.S.B., New Series, XI, 1915, 490-91.

²⁵ Ferishta, II, 306-8, says that he also carried out a successful campaign in Orissa. But Stirling is correct in saying: "The fact that the Muhammadans were levying blackmail from [] in 1451 when the great Kapilendradēva was ruling, is unthinkable." *Asiatic Researches*, XV, 275.

²⁶ T.S.A., 10.

²⁷ T.A., I, 301; Ferishta, I, 157; II, 308; T.S.A., 20; T.D., 13. Only Ni'amatulla has 855. *Makhzan*, 44 (a).

²⁸ Ferishta, II, 308.

²⁹ Ahmad Yādgār calls her Bibi Matto while Rizqu'lla has Mastu. T.S.A., 11; W.M., 3 (a) and [] (a).

in male attire, and stationed them on the battlements to make a show of numbers.²⁰ But the ruse was of no avail. The enemy was very strong and when he started shelling the city,²¹ Bayezid and Sarwanī, son-in-law of Qutb Khan Lodī, decided to sue for peace. They sent Saiyyad Shamsuddīn to Dariyā Khan with the keys of the fort, but the envoy appealed to the latter's racial sentiment and pleaded with him not to side with Mahmūd in the Afghan-Turk war. Dariyā Khan was so much impressed with Shamsuddīn's impassioned appeal that he sent him back without taking the keys of the fort.²² He explained off the affair to Sultan Mahmūd by asserting that occupation of the fort was not so important or urgent as checking the advance of Bahlūl who, having learnt of the siege, had turned back from Deopapur²³ and had arrived at Panipat. Once Sultan Bahlūl was defeated, he argued, Delhi would automatically fall into their hands.

Even after this Mahmūd foolishly lent a ready ear to Dariyā Khan. At his suggestion he and Fatḥ Khan Harwī were sent with 30,000 horse and 40 elephants to check the advance of Bahlūl. By that time Bahlūl had reached Narela,²⁴ seventeen miles from Delhi. He had only 14,000 men²⁵ with him, but he did not despair of the outcome. On the contrary his patrols carried away cattle and horses of the Jaunpur army, and the next day he launched an all out attack. Fatḥ Khan's elephant was disabled by the master archer Qutb Khan with a single shot,²⁶ and his movements were retarded. Qutb Khan, probably unaware of the interview between Dariyā Khan and Shamsuddīn, then shouted out to Dariyā Khan: "Your mothers and sisters are besieged in the fort. What sort of ■■■ are you that you are seeking victory for a stranger without

²⁰ T.S.A., 11; T.D., 14; W.M., 3 (a).

²¹ T.S.A., 11. *لفکر ساہاوا و گرجیج بر آوردہ شعلہائی آتش بازی چنان در قلعه می انداختند* (The soldiers set up *sdbāi* and *gargash* and hurled naphtha packets (caskets of fire) inside the fort).

²² W.M., 3 (b).

²³ T.A., I, 301; T.D., 15; M.R., I, 440.

²⁴ Now a railway station on the Delhi-Kalka line. T.A., I, 301; T.S.A., 12; W.M., 3 (b).

²⁵ T.S.A., 13; T.D., 15-16. 'Abdulla adds that according to some writers Bahlūl had only 7,000 soldiers with him. W.M., ■ (a) - (b) also has 7,000.

²⁶ T.S.A., 13; T.A., I, 301.

having any regard for your own honour"?²⁷ Dariyā Khan hardly needed this sermon; he had already decided to leave the field. His retreat completely crippled Fatāh Khan's strength and he was defeated and captured. As Fatāh Khan had killed Pithora, brother of Rai Karan of Shamsābād, the latter severed his head and presented it to Sultan Bahlūl.²⁸ The Sharqī king could not bear the shock of this catastrophe and retreated towards Jaunpur. But his chagrin was great and this campaign only touched off a long-drawn out war between the two "kingdoms".

Bahlūl's success, against really heavy odds, was indeed brilliant; it also served to open his eyes to the danger of the existence of an independent kingdom like Jaunpur and to convince him of the necessity for its destruction. He had not been able to go personally to recruit Afghan levies because of Mahmūd's invasion, but he was now more than ■■■■ convinced that he could not do without them. Consequently, he sent letters to the leaders of the different clans of the Afghans in Roh inviting them on liberal terms to come to Hindustan in large numbers and in course of time they swarmed into India to join the Sultan "like ants and locusts".²⁹

Meanwhile, encouraged by the success against ■ powerful king like Mahmūd, Bahlūl Lodī marched out with his army to obtain or compel the allegiance of the chiefs of the provinces round about. Mewat lay in the immediate neighbourhood and he marched to it first. Ahmad Khan Mewatī made his submission and gave seven parganas ■ a token of subservience. His uncle Mubārak Khan also entered the service of the Sultan. Bahlūl then went to Baran where Dariyā Khan Lodī, governor of Sambal, made a similar present of seven parganas. At Kol, 'Isa Khan, at Burhanabad, Mubārak Khan the governor of Saket,³⁰ and at Bhongaon, Rai Pratap promised allegiance to the Sultan and were left in full possession of their territories. Only when Bahlūl arrived at Rapri did he meet with some resistance, for Qutb Khan, son of Hasan Khan, had shut himself up in the fort. The citadel was soon taken,

²⁷ T.S.A., 13; *Makhzan*, 44 (b); Dorn, 47. Ferishta, I, 175; T.A., I, 301; T.D., 16.

²⁸ T.A., I, 302; Ferishta, I, 175. M.R., I, 441.

²⁹ 'Abbās Sarwani in Roy's translation of *Makhzan*, 67-69.

³⁰ Burhanabad is said to have been near Mathura, which lies about 15 miles north of Etah. Saket is also in Etah.

but at the intercession of Khan-i-Jahān, Qutb Khan was pardoned and his jagirs were returned.⁴¹ Etawah also submitted without resistance.

It was a policy of firmness coupled with broad-based liberality which had won Bahlūl the allegiance of many otherwise proud and powerful chieftains, and within a year of his accession he had been able to assert his authority over the entire central region from the Punjab to the very frontiers of Jaunpur. But his advance in ■■■ far as Etwah brought him into clash with the king of Jaunpur who had known no rest since his last defeat. Goaded by his wife Bibi Raji,⁴² Mahmūd Sharqī came to Etwah to fight Bahlūl once again.⁴³ Bahlūl was not prepared for a full-scale war and after ■■■ day's contest (and at the intervention of Qutb Khan and Rai Pratap Singh), a truce favourable to Mahmūd was concluded ■■■ the following terms:

- (1) Whatever had been in the possession of Mubārak Shāh Saiyyad (A. D. 1421-1434) was to belong to Bahlūl Lodī, and whatever was then included in the Jaunpur kingdom ■■■ to belong to Mahmūd Sharqī.
- (2) Sultan Bahlūl was to return the seven elephants of Jaunpur he had captured at the time of the defeat of Fatāh Khan Harwī.
- (3) At the end of the rains, Bahlūl Lodī was to take Shamsābād from Malik Jūnā, who was holding it on behalf of Sultan Mahmūd.⁴⁴

The last term of the truce, which Mahmūd did not intend to honour, soon became ■■■ cause for another conflict between Delhi and Jaunpur. When, at the stipulated time, Bahlūl wrote to Jūnā

⁴¹ T.A., I, 302. Ferishta, I, 175-6 generally agrees; also Dorn, 47-48. T.S.A. and Badaoni do not give ■■■ movements. T.D., 17, only gives a brief reference.

⁴² T.D. and *Mahharan*, 45 (a) call her daughter of Sultan 'Alāuddīn Saiyyad, but she ■■■ probably his sister ■■■ Khonza, 'Alāuddīn's daughter,' ■■■ married to Mahmūd's son Husain Sharqī. Also W.M., 5 (b).

⁴³ Dorn, 48.

⁴⁴ T.A., ■■■ 302-303; Ferishta, I, 176; M.R., I, 442, Dorn, 48; *Mahharan*, 45 (a-b). Badaoni gives no details.

Khan to vacate Shamsābād, he refused to do so.⁴⁵ Bahlūl thereupon forcibly seized it and gave it to Rai Karan. At this Sultan Mahmūd marched to Shamsābād with his army in A. D. 1456 (861 H),⁴⁶ and both sides prepared for war. On ■■■ of these days Qutb Khan Lodī and Dariyā Khan Lodī delivered ■ night attack ■ the enemy but in the fight Qutb Khan's horse stumbled and he was taken captive. He was sent to Jaunpur to be imprisoned there. Bahlūl Lodī now prepared for a full-scale battle; he left Rai Karan to hold the fort and sent princes Sikandar and Jalāl and 'Imādul Mulk against Mahmūd, and himself followed them a little later. But at this juncture Sultan Mahmūd suddenly died, A. D. 1457 (862 H),⁴⁷ and the war ended abruptly.

But the death of Mahmūd in camp did in no way affect the position of the Jaunpuris because of the illustrious and sagacious queen of the deceased Sultan, Bibi Rajī. She, in consultation with the elite of the court, proclaimed Mahmūd's son, Bhikhan Khan, as the Sultan of Jaunpur with the title of Muhammad Shāh and patched up ■ truce with Sultan Bahlūl on the condition that "the territory ruled over by Sultan Mahmūd should be held by Sultan Muhammad, while Sultan 'Alāuddīn's possessions should belong to Sultan Bahlūl".⁴⁸ The two armies then returned to their respective capitals.⁴⁹

As Bahlūl was close on Delhi, Shams Khātūn, his principal wife and the sister of Qutb Khan, sent him word that rest and repose were unlawful for him until he had rescued his cousin, Qutb Khan. It is not surprising that Bahlūl had not asked for his release when the new Sharqī king had entered into a covenant with him. He was on the defensive and in spite of the round about way in which the chroniclers write, he had lost much territory in the last truce, having been pushed back to 'Alāuddīn's frontiers in the east. Anyway, Shams Khātūn's exhortation spurred him to action and without entering Delhi he turned from Dhankur, about 28 miles S. E. of Delhi, to march to Jaunpur with no other design than that of

⁴⁵ T.A., I, 303. *Makhzan*, 45 (b). Shamsābād, 18 miles N.W. of Fatehgarh, had a fort in Akbar's time. *Āfn.*, II, 196.

⁴⁶ *Ferishta*, II, 308.

⁴⁷ *Ferishta*, II, 308; Z.W., I, 135. Also *Chronicles*, 323.

⁴⁸ *Makhzan*, 45 (b). ⁴⁹ T.A., I, 303; *Ferishta*, I, 176; II, 308.

effecting the release of Qutb Khan. Thereupon, Muhammad Sharqī also returned to meet him. First Muhammad went to Shamsābād, wrested it from Rai Karan and made it over to Jūnā Khan. His strength even made Rai Pratap side with him this time. Shifting of loyalties was a common feature of these wars, and the instance of Dariyā Khan Lodī is a glaring example of it. Muhammad arrived at Sarsuti = Sirsa⁵⁰ and halted there; Bahlūl had already arrived in Rapri lying close to Sirsa. The rival forces occasionally clashed in minor engagements.

Muhammad Sharqī was a man who could turn friends into foes.⁵¹ He was wrathful and blood-thirsty. His Amīrs dreaded him, his brothers feared him and even his mother developed contempt and hatred for him. While he was at Sirsa he got inkling of a conspiracy at Jaunpur, and sent instructions to the Kotwal there to put to death his brothers Hasan Khan and Qutb Khan,⁵² while to beguile his mother he asked her to ——— to the camp and effect a compromise between him and his brother Hasan. The unsuspecting lady started from Jaunpur. On her way, at Qannauj, she learnt of the assassination of poor Hasan. She halted there to observe the mourning ——— which Muhammad wrote to her that since all the princes were to meet the same fate, she could mourn for them all at once.⁵³ The queen-mother could hardly tolerate such an insult

⁵⁰ Nizāmuddin (T.A., I, De, 304), and Ferishta (I, 176 and II, 308) have سرستی. C.H.I., 231 makes it Saraswati. The place meant is most probably the old village of Sirsa, now called Sirsaganj, near Rapri, 27 miles south of Mainpuri and 14 miles from Shikohabad. This Sirsa is different from that of the East Punjab. I.G. Atlas, 31 A3; N.W.P. Gazetteer, 1876 Ed., IV, 731.

⁵¹ T.A., I, 304; T.S.A., 15.

⁵² Nizāmuddin explicitly mentions Qutb Khan, son of Islām Khan Lodī, then a prisoner at Jaunpur. T.A., I, 304 and Ferishta, II, 308 also have Qutb Khan Lodī. 'Abdulla has princes Hasan Khan and Qutb Khan. T.D., 18. Ahmad Yādgār too has Qutb Khan and the two sons of Sultan Mahmūd (T.S.A., 14). Elliot adds a note, E and D, V, 82, to clarify the confusion. "In the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*", says he, "they are called two ——— of Sultan Shāh by name Hasan Khan and Qutb Khan. The insertion of Lodī must be an error, though his father's name was also Sultan Shāh. These princes ——— evidently of the Jaunpur family, and Sultan Shāh (Jaunpur) himself appears as one of the conspirators against Muhammad Shāh." Sultan Muhammad of Jaunpur had ordered the death of Qutb Khan Jaunpuri and not of the Lodī prisoner of war of the same name. The Persian chroniclers have mixed up the two. ⁵³ T.S.A., 15.

added to grief, and determined to destroy the fiend. She sent a word to her other sons present in the camp at Sirsa to escape with their armies. Princes Husain and Jalāl, on the pretext of repulsing an expected night attack from Bahlūl, moved off with their contingents towards Qannauj,⁵⁴ but Jalāl Khan fell into the hands of Bahlūl, who made him captive as a reprisal for the imprisonment of Qutb Khan.⁵⁵

Muhammad Khan was bewildered at the turn of events, and he decided to retreat. On the road to Qannauj he was hotly pursued and mauled by Bahlūl's ■■■ up to the Ganga. At Qannauj the queen-mother had arranged a hostile reception for him. In consultation with the chief nobles she had already declared prince Husain as the Sultan,⁵⁶ and when Muhammad Shāh arrived near Rajgarh⁵⁷ on the Ganga, Bibi Rāji sent Malik Mubārak Gung and Malik 'Alī Gujarātī with the newly crowned Husain Shāh to oppose him. Their arrival completely unnerved Muhammad, and caused major desertions in his camp. Left but with a few men he took up a position in ■ neighbouring garden. Muhammad was a good archer but ■■■ Rāji had neutralised this advantage through his armorer, who had removed the points from the arrows in his quiver. Helpless, he fought with his sword, killed a few men, but was in the end struck down by ■ arrow shot by Mubārak Gung.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ T.A., I, 304-5; Ferishta, I, 176; II, 309; *Makhzan*, 46 (b).

⁵⁵ T.A., I, 305; *Makhzan*, 47 (a).

⁵⁶ Dorn, 50 and *Makhzan*, 47 (b) give the date of his accession as 857 H. But that is not correct.

According to Ferishta, II, 308, Sultan Mahmūd died in 862 H. He also says that Muhammad ruled for five ■■■ only, II, 309. Therefore Husain must have ascended the throne of Jaunpur in the very year in which Mahmūd and Muhammad died, i.e. 862-3 H.

⁵⁷ T.A., I, 305 has گجر راجہ. Ferishta, II, 309, has the fort of Ajar; while *Makhzan*, 47, (b) has Rajgarh. I cannot locate the place which possibly was on the Ganga.

⁵⁸ T.A., I, 306; Ferishta, I, 176; II, 309; *Makhzan*, 47 (b); T.D., 19.

T.S.A., 15-16 says ■■■ captured alive. It is not possible to say definitely as to how long he ruled. Muhammad's coins as well as those of Sultan Husain of the years 861, 862 and 863 H exist. May be the two rival princes were contending for power and each was issuing coins in his own name.

Nizāmuddin credits Muhammad with a reign of five years, but that is a clear case of miswriting Sāi for Māh. Ferishta (II, 308-9) says that Mahmūd

The new Sharqī Sultan Husain's first act was to enter into an agreement with Sultan Bahlūl. The two monarchs agreed on a truce for a period of four years. Each party was to be content with his own dominions and was to refrain from acts of aggression. The two royal prisoners Qutb Khan Lodī and Jalāl were exchanged, but Shamsābād remained in the hands of the Sharqīs. Qutb Khan Lodī had been in captivity for seven months.⁵⁰ With his release and because of the turn of events in Jaunpur politics the war came to a close in an atmosphere of cordiality. Also through the good offices of Qutb Khan Afghan, Rai Pratap was reconciled to Sultan Bahlūl.

Bahlūl observed the truce for the stipulated period, from 1457

died in 861 H. (A.D. 1457) and Muhammad reigned only for five months. Lane-Poole says that Muhammad ruled jointly with his father from 861 to 863 H. *Chronicles*, 320-23; Nelson Wright, *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum Calcutta*, Vol. II, Part II. Also J.A.S.B., XIII, 107-8.

The chronology of the Sharqī Kings is extremely confusing (H.M. Whittell, Numismatic Supplement No. XXXVI to the J.A.S.B., 1922), but from the narrative of events given by Persian chroniclers it appears that Muhammad had a short reign of five months rather than a long one of five years.

"Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, Ni'amatulla, Ahmad Yādgār and 'Abdulla say that Qutb Khan Lodī had been in captivity for seven years. Only Ferishta (I, 176 lines 7 ff) has seven months.

T.A., I, 303; *Makhzan*, 47 (a); T.S.A., 14; T.D., 17. A.B. Pandey in *The First Afghan Empire in India*, 73, agrees with the other chroniclers.

But the period of incarceration given by Ferishta appears to be more reasonable. The year of the last war between Bahlūl and Mahmūd Sharqī is not known, but it is clear from the narrative of the chroniclers that Qutb Khan was imprisoned only a little before the death of Mahmūd. Mahmūd had died in camp while the war was on. His successor Muhammad ruled for five months only (Ferishta, II, 309). The first act of Muhammad's successor Husain Shāh was to make terms with Bahlūl and release Qutb Khan. So seven months and not seven years is the correct time. Badaonī does not explicitly mention seven months but implies that Qutb's release was effected within a period of one year. (I, 307-8; Ranking I, 404). It may also be remembered that Bahlūl had not visited Delhi during this time. As he was returning after the battle with Mahmūd, Shams Khātūn had sent him a taunting message which had made him immediately turn back towards Jaunpur. He was in all probability not away from the capital for seven long years just after his accession. Pandey's mistake lies in accepting July, 1452 (p. 72 n. 5) for the "second war" with Jaunpur, for which there is no warrant.

to 1461 (862-866 H). After its expiry he marched to Shamsābād,⁶⁰ took it from Jūnā Khan and handed it back to Rai Karan.⁶¹ What his further plans were ■■■ cannot tell. Probably after this success he wanted to march to Jaunpur, but an unfortunate incident at least marred his further progress. Finding the Sultan at Shamsābād, Narsingh Rai,⁶² son of Rai Pratap Singh, came to pay him respect. Some time previous to this Rai Pratap had wrested the kettledrum and standard from Dariyā Khan, who had felt bitterly humiliated. To avenge his insult he killed Pratap's son in Shamsābād. Because of this heinous crime, say Ferishta and Ni'amatulla, Rai Pratap, Qutb Khan, ■■■ of Husain Khan Afghan, the governor of Rapri, and Mubāriz Khan deserted to Sultan Husain Sharqi. Bahlūl, who could neither punish his cousin Dariyā Khan Lodi⁶³ nor provide redress to Rai Pratap, could now hardly proceed further east and returned to Delhi.

After ■■■ time Bahlūl Lodi started for Multan in fulfilment of his promise to its ex-ruler Yūsuf Qureshī, leaving the charge of Delhi to Qutb Khan Lodi and Khan-i-Jahān.⁶⁴ We have seen that in the very year of his accession, Bahlūl had tried to go to Multan to re-establish his authority, but the Sharqi king had foiled his plan. All the same, his movements had terribly frightened Yūsuf Qureshī, the elected ruler of Multan, and he had started looking out for friends and supporters. One Rai Sehra, leader of the Langāh tribe of the Afghans, wrote many flattering letters to Yūsuf Qureshī, promising him support against Bahlūl Lodi,⁶⁵ and as a proof of his loyalty married his daughter to Yūsuf. Thereafter the Langāh chief used to pay frequent visits to Multan with a large retinue under the plea of seeing his daughter. About the year A. D. 1454 he marched with his army to Multan on the pretext of its "review" by the Sultan, but then threw off the mask, occupied the capital

⁶⁰ So has Ferishta, I, 176; Nizāmuddin says "after some time".

⁶¹ T.A., I, 307; Dorn, 51; *Makhzan*, 48 (a).

⁶² T.A. has نارنگ without any dots above or below. Ferishta, I, 176, has Narsingh, Dorn, 51, Rai Bir Singh Deo, and *Makhzan*, 48 (a), Narsingh.

⁶³ Nothing is heard of Dariyā Khan hereafter. Probably he died a natural death, for had he been ■■■ by Bahlūl for ■■■ crime, Rai Pratap would have been reconciled with the Sultan.

⁶⁴ T.A., I, 307; Ferishta, I, 177; Dorn, 51.

⁶⁵ Ferishta, II, 325.

and took the title of Sultan Qutbuddīn Mahmūd Langāh. The people of Multan had no option but to submit to his rule.⁶⁶

Shaikh Yūsuf escaped to Delhi. Bahlūl Lodī received him cordially, and promised to help him regain the throne. Many a time he tried to march to Multan but the Sharqī kings gave him no respite. Now, after four years of peace with Jaunpur when he had occupied Shamsābād without opposition, Bahlūl marched to Multan in compliance of his promise to the Shaikh. But he was mistaken, for while he was on his way, he was informed that Husain Sharqī had started for Delhi. Bahlūl immediately turned back to meet him.

Extinction of the Sharqī Kingdom

Sultan Husain Sharqī was determined to maintain the tradition of his warlike house. One of his first acts after accession was to put to death several officers who had headed a party against him. Now, the loss of Shamsābād and the defection of Rai Pratap and Qutb Khan prompted him to march against Delhi in A. D. 1463 (868 H). Sultan Bahlūl after a precipitate march-back met his adversary at Chandwār.⁶⁷ Skirmishes continued for a whole week and there was some shifting of loyalties, but at last through the exertions of the chief men of the two camps a three-year truce, on the usual condition that each party should be content with its own kingdom, was patched up.⁶⁸

During this period of three years Sultan Husain besieged Etawah and captured it from its ruler. Ferishta says that he did so after the expiry of the period of truce,⁶⁹ although Nizāmuddīn gives the impression that immediately after the truce, as Bahlūl returned to Delhi, Sultan Husain went to Etawah and captured it.⁷⁰ It is, however, clear that after three years' time, when the hostilities were resumed, Husain Sharqī was well-established at Etawah and

⁶⁶ Qutbuddīn Langāh died in 874 H after ruling for sixteen years after which his son Husain succeeded him in A. D. 1469 (874 H). Ferishta, II, 325.

Obviously he must have ascended the throne in or about 858 H (A. D. 1454) after removing Yūsuf from Multan.

⁶⁷ T.A., I, 307; Ferishta, I, 177.

Maḥṣan, 48 (a). Dorn does not mention the place.

⁶⁸ T.A., I, 307; Ferishta, I, 177; Dorn, 51; *Maḥṣan*, 48 (a).

⁶⁹ Ferishta, I, 177. ⁷⁰ T.A., I, 307-8.

had made it a base of operations.⁷¹ He had introduced new vigour into the civil and military affairs of Jaunpur. In A. D. 1466 (871 H)⁷² he repaired the fort of Benares (Varanasi) and in the same year sent an expedition to Gwalior compelling its Raja to come over to his side.⁷³ Ferishta and Wolseley Haig even credit him with leading a campaign into Orissa and defeating its ruler Kapileshwar Deva⁷⁴ but this claim is refuted by modern historians of Orissa.⁷⁵ All the while his power and fame encouraged defections in Bahlul's camp. The last to go over to the Sharqi side were Rustam Khan, governor of Kol and Ahmad Khan, son of Yusuf Khan Jalwani, the governor of Bayana.⁷⁶

So in A. D. 1466 at the expiry of the period of three years, Husain Sharqi marched towards Delhi with 100,000 horse and 1,000 elephants. Sultan Bahlul too led his army and fought the adversary near Bhatwara,⁷⁷ and a little later near Sarai Lashkar, 25 miles east of Delhi,⁷⁸ nipping in the bud the grandiose scheme of the adversary. Sultan Husain hardly achieving anything much returned to Etawah.⁷⁹ There his mother, the illustrious matron

⁷¹ Dorn, 51. Also T.A., I, 308 and Ferishta, I, 177.

⁷² Ferishta, II, 310; C.I. S.G., I, 232.

⁷³ T.A., III, 284; Ferishta, II, 310.

⁷⁴ Ferishta, II, 309-10. C.H.I., III, 235.

⁷⁵ R.D. Banerji, *History of Orissa*, I, 291; H. K. Mahtab, *The History of Orissa*, 83.

⁷⁶ The triangular conflict between the sultans of Delhi, Malwa and Jaunpur was the opportunity for the Auhadi (later Jalwani) governors of Bayana. They played successfully upon the rivalry of the three kings, and this won for Mahmud Khan Auhadi the gold crown of Mahmud Khalji of Malwa. (T.A., III, 330.) Under Ahmad Khan Jalwani the dynasty fell.

⁷⁷ T.A., I, 308; Briggs Ranking all have Bhatwara. Also *Mahasan*, 46 (b) and Dorn, 51. Ferishta, I, 177, has Thawara. The place is difficult to identify.

⁷⁸ *Mahasan*, 46 (b). Dorn has Sarai only. Several MSS. of T.A. have Ray-singh and the text has *راي سنگ*. (T.A., De, 347 a. 3). Ferishta, I, 177, has *راي سنگ*. C.H.I., III, identifies it with Sikbara, 25 miles east of Delhi.

⁷⁹ "Sikbara in Sirhpur pargana, Kasganj tehsil, Etah district might be the battle-site." Roy, *Mahasan's* trs., 43, n. 2.

⁸⁰ Ferishta ascribes this campaign to A. D. 1473 (878 H), while Nizamuddin puts it somewhere in A. D. 1469 (873 H).

Ferishta, II, 310; T.A., III, 346-49.

There is no contemporary account, and the chronology of these later writers is not precise.

Bibi Rāji, breathed her last.⁸⁰ Bahlūl considered it a good opportunity to placate his powerful enemy and sent Qutb Khan Lodī and Kalyān Mal, ■ of Rai Kirti Singh of Gwalior⁸¹ (1455-1479), to convey his condolences to Sultan Husain. They found the atmosphere at Etawah fully surcharged with hostility towards Delhi, and the Sharqī king unaccommodating. Even they could manage their return only with great difficulty.

The failure of Qutb Khan Lodī's mission prompted Bahlūl to make all-round preparations for the inevitable war. He even decided to seek outside help. In 1468 (873 H) he despatched Shaikh-zādā Muhammad Farmūlī and Kalyān Mal to Mahmūd Khaljī of Malwa with an appeal for help against Husain Sharqī, and promised to give Bayana in lieu of the aid. Nothing could have pleased the Khaljī monarch more than to have received such a message from Delhi. He promised to send 6,000 horse to the aid of Bahlūl if and when Husain marched against him next.⁸² Although Mahmūd Khaljī died the same year and with him his promise of help, yet Bahlūl's appeal shows the gravity of the situation, and the encouraging reply of Mahmūd must have given him great moral strength.

In all probability Bahlūl's preparations prompted caution in Husain Sharqī, and for a time he dropped the idea of attacking Delhi. For a decade after this he went on making preparations for an attack on Delhi. Then an incident sparked off major war between Jaunpur and Delhi. In A. D. 1478 (883 H) the last Saiyyad ruler 'Alāuddīn 'Ālam Shāh died at Badaon.⁸³ Sultan Husain went there to offer his condolences, but ended by wresting Badaon from the sons of the deceased. Ni'āmatulla denounces him for "such mean action"⁸⁴ but the Sharqī monarch knew that Badaon could not be held by 'Ālam Shāh's sons and that that strategic town would sooner or later be taken by Bahlūl. So he only forestalled Bahlūl, because he would take no risks. From Badaon he pushed on to Sambhal

⁸⁰ T.A., I, 308.

⁸¹ T.A., I, 308; Dorn, 51; *Makhzan*, 48 (b). Only Ferishta, I, 177 says that it was the Raja himself and not his son who went to Gwalior.

⁸² Ferishta, II, 252-53. The names of the ambassadors are given as Muhammad Farmūlī and Kapūr Chand in *Ma'āsir-i-Mahmūd Sādi*, Camb. MS., 471-76, cited in *The Delhi Sultanate*, 240, n. 9.

⁸³ Ferishta, I, 177; No one else gives the date of his death.

⁸⁴ Dorn, 52; *Makhzan*, 48 (b).

and imprisoning its governor Mubārak Khan, son of Tātār Khan,⁸⁵ sent him to Sāran in Bihār.

This sweep of arms was followed by a blow at the Lodī capital itself. Husain advanced upon [] in March, A. D. 1479 (Zilhijja, 883 H)⁸⁶ and encamped [] the ford of Kichcha. Bahlūl was at this time absent in Sarhind, but returned quickly [] hearing of Hussain's campaign. But the odds were against him. The Jaunpur army was superior both in numbers and in strength. It consisted of 1,40,000 horse and 1,400 elephants while the Lodī monarch had only 18,000 troops under him.⁸⁷ Bahlūl sent a hurried summons to Husain Khan, the son of Khan-i-Khanān, at Meerut,⁸⁸ and even wrote to the king of Malwa for help, but he could hardly postpone the engagement till any [] or [] a reply arrived. There was no hope of victory. Bahlūl could ~~not~~ even fight an open battle with such a small army, and so he resorted to an artifice. He made Qutb Khan Lodī write a very servile letter to Sultan Husain saying: "I am a grateful servant of Bibi Rāji. When I [] a prisoner at Jaunpur she had treated me with utmost kindness. Now the best course to pursue is to make peace, and return. Let the countries on the other side of the Ganga be ruled by you, and those on this side by Sultan Bahlūl."⁸⁹ The terms were simply ridiculous, for the Sharqī king [] to get territory as near as 18 kos from Delhi, but Husain Shāh, who was blind with joy, failed to see through them. He made the peace, and marched away.

But no [] had he moved eastwards, than Sultan Bahlūl started in pursuit.⁹⁰ It was a breach of faith, but it was not Bahlūl alone who had been guilty of it. Sultan Husain had broken his promises [] often. Moreover, with the death of Sultan 'Alāuddīn, Bahlūl must have given up even that little regard which he might have had for the son-in-law of his benefactor. The fact of the matter

⁸⁵ T.A., I, 309; Ferishta, I, 177. Badaoni, I, 309, says Tātār Khan was imprisoned.

⁸⁶ T.A., I, 309; Ferishta, I, 177; *Makharan*, 48 (b)—49 (a). Badaoni wrongly has 880 H but later on gives the right chronogram of Husain's defeat as *نريد خراب* (Yidings of Ruin) or 883 H. Badaoni, I, 310; Ranking, I, 407.

⁸⁷ Ferishta, II, 310.

⁸⁸ Badaoni, I, 309; Ranking, I, 406.

⁸⁹ T.A., I, 309; Ferishta, I, 177; T.D., 19-20.

⁹⁰ T.A., I, 309; Ferishta, I, 177; T.D., 20.

is that the temporary agreements between the two monarchs were patched up just for the convenience of one side or the other or of both. Both believed in swallowing up the territory of the other. Yet neither was strong enough to do it. Bahlūl as the Sultan of Delhi wanted to reunite Hindustan under one rule. Husain Sharqī thought that Delhi belonged to him by right because his wife was the daughter of the last Salyyad Sultan 'Alāuddīn. The sword was the arbiter and both believed in its efficacy.

In short, Sultan Husain was taken by complete surprise. Due to excessive haughtiness and pride he had disbelieved the reports of his spies that Bahlūl was marching in pursuit.⁶¹ Bahlūl Lodī suddenly fell on him from behind, plundered Husain's baggage train and took prisoner the flower of the Jaunpur nobility including Jaunpur's Vazīr Shamsuddīn,⁶² entitled Qutlugh Khan, one of the most learned men of his age. Leaving him in chains with Qutb Khan Lodī, Bahlūl kept on the trail of the retreating army and on the way he occupied Kol, Jalālī, Kampil, Patiali, Shamsābād and Saket.⁶³ The pursuit had gone on unchallenged so far, but at the village of Rampanchu,⁶⁴ near Rapri, the Sharqī king turned back and gave battle. But he was not in a position to dictate terms, and agreeing to recognise Dhopamañ ■ the boundary⁶⁵ between the two kingdoms, he went away to Rapri while Bahlūl Lodī returned to Delhi.⁶⁶

The campaign brought to Bahlūl many advantages. He had seized many strategic places like Patiali and Shamsābād. Besides he had taken prisoner forty important officers of Jaunpur, including its Prime Minister. Indeed Bahlūl's star was in the ascendant and his morale was high. But the youthful Husain could not make a cor-

⁶¹ Ferishta, II, 310.

⁶² Badaoni, Ranking, I, 406.

⁶³ Ferishta, I, 177, has Jalasār. T.A., I, 310 and M.R., I, 448, have Jalālī. Jalālī lies 13 miles east of Aligarh (Kol). Distt. Gaz. U.P., VI, 448.

Ferishta does not mention Kol. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 407, says Bahlūl pursued Husain as far as Shamsābād in the Doab.

⁶⁴ *Makhzan*, 49 (a). Ferishta has Rampinjra. Badaoni only says that the battle took place in the vicinity of Rapri. T.A. has Arām Mahjur. M.R., I, 448 ■ Arām Bhajō.

⁶⁵ Ferishta, I, 177.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 177; T.A., I, 310 and Badaoni, I, 310, say he returned to Dhopamañ. According to *Makhzan* both repaired to their dominions. Dorn, 32.

rect appraisal of the situation, and after some time he again advanced against Sultan Bahlul. A fierce battle was fought near Sonhar in Etah district⁹⁷ in which Husain was badly defeated. An immense amount of booty fell into the hands of Bahlul Lodi which added to his strength and influence. Sultan Husain retreated to Rapri in such desperate hurry that, while crossing the Jumna, many of his officers, wives and children ■■■■ drowned.⁹⁸ This caused him great affliction.⁹⁹ The fugitive took a detour via Gwalior on his way to Jaunpur, but near Hathkant he was attacked by a band of Bhadauri Rajputs,¹⁰⁰ who plundered whatever little had been left with him. Broken and tired he reached Gwalior, whose Raja, because of old friendship, offered him every help and escorted him up to Kalpi.¹⁰¹

In the meantime Sultan Bahlul ■■■■ busy consolidating his gains. He had wrested Etawah from Ibrāhim Khan, brother of Husain Sharqi, and had settled it upon Ibrāhim Khan, son of Mubārak Khan Nūhāni. He also conferred certain parganas contiguous to Etawah on Rai Dandu¹⁰² ■■■■ his reward for cooperation. His last

⁹⁷ *Makhzan*, ■■■■ (a); T.A., I, 310; Badaoni, I, 310 and M.R., I, 448 have Sonhār. Ferishta, I, 177 has سَنَهَار. C.H.I., III, 233, 237 and n. thinks it to be Senha or Suhnuh in Lat. 27°-21' N., Long. 78°-48' E.

According to the district Gazetteer the battle was fought in the village of Sonhar in Etah Tehsil. Distt. Gaz. U. P., XII, 175; I.G. XII, 36. Hodivala, 493.

⁹⁸ T.A., I, 311; Ferishta, I, 177; M.R., I, 449.

⁹⁹ *Makhzan*, 49 (b).

¹⁰⁰ According to Abul Fazi Bhadawar was a district S.E. of Agra and Hathkant was its chief town. Its inhabitants, called Bhadauria (Rajputs), were known as daring robbers. In spite of their close proximity to the capital, they managed to maintain their independence till Akbar had their chief trampled to death, when they submitted. *Atn.*, I, 488. Elliot, *Races*, I, 25. Cited in Badaoni, Ranking, I, 408 n. 1.

¹⁰¹ Badaoni, I, 311; Also Ferishta, I, 177-78 and T.A., I, 311. *Makhzan* 49 (b).

¹⁰² The name is variously written and creates confusion. Ferishta, I, 178, line 2 and *Makhzan* 50 (a) have داندو. Dorn, I, 53 has Dandoo. Nizāmuddin, T.A., I, 311 has Daud. The Raja of Etawah was Sakat (Shakti) Singh and his son was Dandu or Dande Rao. Both of them are mentioned in the Dynastic list of the Chauhan Rajas of Partabner. N.W.F. Gaz. (Ed. 1876), IV, 374 and n.

For centuries the Chauhans had been in great strength in Mainpuri and Etawah. Vira Bhānū and ■■■■ Pratap (Rudra) belonged to this tribe. The

victories as well as the losses of Husain had encouraged him to give up the defensive role, and he was determined to fight the Sharqīs to the finish. He marched to Kalpi where Husain was staying. Sultan Husain also advanced from Kalpi to meet him. The two forces encamped on either side of the Ganga. Because of the river lying between them, only short skirmishes were fought for several months without yielding victory to either side. Then Rai Trilok Chand, ruler of Bagesar (Baksar of the chroniclers)¹⁰³ pointed out to Bahlūl a ford through which the Sultan stealthily crossed over to the other side. Sultan Husain was taken by surprise, his forces were scattered, and he retired southwards to the territory of Bhata¹⁰⁴ (Bhatghora, modern Rewa). Its Raja Bhédchandra of Baghela dynasty treated Husain Shāh well, gave him a few lakh *tanhās*, some horses and elephants and escorted him up to Jaunpur.

Even in his capital Husain Shāh did not find a safe refuge for Sultan Bahlūl was following him close at his heels. When the latter arrived near Jaunpur, Sultan Husain slipped to Qannauj by way of Bahraich. Bahlūl kept up the pursuit, went up to Qannauj and engaged his adversary on the banks of Rahāb or Kali Nadi. In the battle, a "defeat which had become almost natural to Sultan Husain, again fell to his lot".¹⁰⁵ His regalia and insignia of royalty and his chief wife Bibi Khunzā,¹⁰⁶ daughter of the late Sultan 'Alāuddin, fell into the hands of Sultan Bahlūl. But he treated her with all honour¹⁰⁷ and sent her back to her husband under an escort.¹⁰⁸ He

town of Mainpuri — founded by Jagannāth, ninth in descent from this Rudra. Hunter, Imp. Gaz., II, 403; Ranking, Badaoni, I, 386, n. 3. Hodivala, 406.

— Bagesar is situated — the left — of the Ganga, 34 miles S.E. of Unao. Hunter, Imp. Gaz., 450; I.G., VI, 218.

¹⁰⁴ T.A., I, 311. *Mahāsas*, 50 (a). Badaoni, I, 311. E and D, V, 89 has 'Panna country' which is incorrect.

¹⁰⁵ T.A., I, 312; Ferishta, I, 178.

¹⁰⁶ Sir Wolsley Haig gives her name as Jalīa (C.H.I., III, 237, 255) but that is a misreading or Hallia which Ferishta calls her (Ferishta, II, 310). Hallia means a lawful wife and instances of its use are many. (See Hodivala, 494). Dorn, 52 speaks of her as the Sultan's "F — consort, Malka Jehan."

¹⁰⁷ "It is in the tradition of Afghan tribal warfare not to molest the women or the children of the enemy." Caroe, 144. Also cf. Sher Shah's treatment of the Mughal queen.

¹⁰⁸ Ferishta, II, 310, Badaoni, I, 311; and Nizāmuddin, T.A., I, 312, say

himself returned to Delhi, determined more than [redacted] on the complete subjugation of Jaunpur.

Having made full preparations for the conquest of Jaunpur, Sultan Bahlūl marched against it. Husain could not put up any effective resistance, and fled to Bahraich. The Jaunpur country, which for nearly a century had been lost to Delhi, was conquered by Bahlūl and reincorporated in the Sultanate.¹⁰⁹ Mubārak Khan Nūhānī was appointed [redacted] its governor. Qutb Khan Lodī, Khan-i-Jahān and [redacted] other nobles were stationed in Majhauī,¹¹⁰ the easternmost town of the Jaunpur kingdom, to keep the newly conquered country under effective control. But [redacted] soon as Bahlūl left for Badaon, Husain Sharqī made a surprise attack on Jaunpur, reoccupied it, and compelled Mubārak Khan Nūhānī to retire to Majhauī. Hearing of these developments, Bahlūl at once sent his son Bārbak Shāh with a large force to the east and himself followed close behind. Finding resistance useless Sultan Husain left Jaunpur for Bihar late in A. D. 1479 (884 H).

With his flight ended the rule of the Sharqī Dynasty of Jaunpur. Bahlūl appointed Bārbak Shāh as the governor of Jaunpur.¹¹¹

that when on a later occasion Bahlūl attacked Jaunpur, she contrived to effect her release. *Makhsas*, 49 (a), mentions of her capture in an earlier context. Whether she was captured twice, is doubtful.

¹⁰⁹ *Ferishtā*, I, 178.

¹¹⁰ Majhauī lies on the left bank of the Little Gandak, Distt. Gorakhpur, Distt. Gaz. U.P., XXXI, 297; Badaoni, *Rashtak*, I, 409 n. 5; Hunter, I.G., IX, 213.

¹¹¹ Numismatic evidence shows that Husain was in power in Jaunpur till only 883 H, although the earliest known coin of Bahlūl Lodī which bears the mint name of Jaunpur is dated 888 H.

Fuhrer states *NEY* Khairuddin Muhammad in his *Jaunpur-Nāma* gives the date of the final deprivation of the kingdom of Husain as 884 [redacted] (A.D. 1479). (J. A. S. B., XVIII, 1922, Numismatic Supplement, XXXVI, 17). Husain Sharqī died in 905 H, but his coins run in complete sequence to 911 and then irregularly to 919 H. [redacted] coins are definitely posthumous. Who issued Husain's coins after 884 H? There can be only one explanation. A son of Husain Sharqī, Jalāldīn, [redacted] married in the Husain dynasty of Bengal, says *Jaunpur-Nāma*. There are graves in Jaunpur where Husain and his descendants lie buried. It is quite possible that one or two descendants of Husain Shāh issued posthumous coins in his name. But numismatists do not help to elucidate the point.

Bahlūl Lodī administered the Sharqī kingdom himself for several years

Leaving him there the Sultan marched to Kalpi and conferred it on his grandson Khwājā Āzam Humayūn, son of Khwājā Bayezīd.¹¹² In a triumphant mood Bahlūl went to Dholpur by way of Chandwār, and exacting tribute from its Raja as well as from Iqbāl Khan, the ruler of Barī, a pargana eighteen miles west of Dholpur, the Sultan returned to Delhi.

Why did the Sharqīs who were in no way second to the Sultans of Delhi in the arts of war and peace, fail against them? The two kingdoms can safely be granted a status of equality,¹¹³ for, if the Afghans, and even their predecessors the Saiyyads, could invoke the sympathies of Gujarat (as in 1409-10) and Malwa (as in 1433 and 1468) the Rajas of Gwalior, Rewa and Bengal used to come to the rescue of the Sharqīs. But in the wars between the two, one is struck by the constant retreats of both the armies sometimes without engaging in any major battle, always without achieving final results except imperfect truces for specific periods. The war between the two kingdoms was, therefore, a war of nerves. As time passed the army of the Sultanate grew very strong. Thousands of Afghans of various tribes from Roh joined its ranks. The Afghans were fine marksmen and it was their excellence in archery¹¹⁴ that nullified Sharqī superiority in numbers. It had many able generals who have been constantly referred to in these pages, while on the side of the Sharqīs we hardly hear of any great commanders. Even then Bahlūl Lodi worked with caution and remained on the defensive for two decades. On the contrary the initial [redacted] of the Sharqīs made them arrogant and even careless. The last campaign of Husain to Delhi shows that he had marched to the very environs of Delhi without adequate preparations, so that on return after the usual truce he could not manage an organised retreat.

and his coins bearing the mint town name of Jaunpur [redacted] known in complete sequence from [redacted] to 893 H. In either 892 H. (A. M. 1486) Bahlūl placed his son Bārbak on the Sharqī throne, or before his death, while dividing his kingdom, confirmed Bārbak in his appointment. J.A.S.B. 1922, Num. Sup., 17-18. Coins of Bārbak Shāh range from 892 to 898, which dates agree with the record of historians. Also Thomas, *Chronicles*, 377. C.I.S.G., I, 233.

¹¹² T.A., I, 312-13; Ferishta, I, 178.

¹¹³ The Sharqī kingdom extended from Ganauj to Bihar, and in its hey-day included Sambhal, Bundēlkhand and Baghelkhand. Jaunpur Gazetteer, 160.

¹¹⁴ For a few examples [redacted] W.M. ¶ (a)-(b); T.S.A., 13; T.A., I, 301.

The early Sharqīs had fought bravely and tactfully. Even Mahmūd and Muhammad had kept Bahlūl on the defensive. But Husain was both ambitious and impetuous and succumbed before the sly diplomat and brave warrior Bahlūl through "carelessness, folly and perhaps physical cowardice". The last Sharqī was an impatient youth, goaded to action ■■■ by the taunts of his wife than by his own martial qualities. He had claimed to fight for the cause of his deposed father-in-law, but Bahlūl had shown towards the Saiyyad King more deference than Husain showed to his brother-in-law whose "kingdom" of Badaon he usurped and thereby earned universal condemnation. The Lodi Sultan by his humility not only retained the loyalty of his Afghan tribesmen, but also won over many from allegiance to the Sharqī monarch. The conduct of Dariyā Khan Lodi of Sambhal, Qutb Khan Afghan of Rapri and Rai Pratap of Bhongaon are glaring instances of this.

Besides, the Afghans had learnt the art of scorched-earth policy. Jaunpur armies always suffered for lack of food and fodder on their march towards Delhi. They had even to bring supplies from Jaunpur and sometimes desertions took place in their army when their supplies ■■■ cut off.¹¹⁵ In the last campaign fought on the banks of the Kali Nadi, Bahlūl managed to cut off Husain's water supply and brought about his defeat. From that time on he was almost a fugitive and his doom was ensured.¹¹⁶

Other Exploits of Bahlūl

Bahlūl Lodi was engaged in a life-and-death struggle against the Sharqīs for ■■■ less than twenty-seven long years (1452-79). Naturally the narrative of the chroniclers of his reign is so replete with the description of wars with Jaunpur that it hardly contains any account of his other activities. Even after the annexation of the Jaunpur kingdom, there is hardly any chronological or authentic account of Bahlūl's last ten years of rule (1480-89), except stray references to his campaigns in Rajasthan, Sindh and Gwalior.

Ahmad Yādgār, the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Salātīn-i-Afghānā*, says that the Sultan marched out against the Rana of Udaipur.

¹¹⁵ Z.W., I, 136.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 136.

(in Rajasthan) with 10,000 horse and fixed his camp at Ajmer.¹¹⁷ Yādgār's narrative has not been corroborated by any other historian, although Col. Tod writes, in a very general way, that Mewar had to contest her northern boundary with the Lodis.¹¹⁸ Sir Henry Elliot in a note on this alleged expedition says that an engagement between the royalists and Mewaris is recorded in the time of Raimal, who ascended the *gaddi* in A. D. 1474, "but the particulars differ in every respect".¹¹⁹ G. S. Ojha also does not accept the story of Yādgār on the ground that Udaipur was not in existence then (it was founded in A. D. 1539 only)¹²⁰ and also because the name of the Sultan of Delhi has not been mentioned by Rajputs bards or Tod.¹²¹ In view of this, all that can be said is that Yādgār has probably confused Malwa with Mewar and Alhanpur with Udaipur. We know on the authority of Nizāmuddīn and Nī'āmatulla that after the conquest of Jaunpur, Bahlūl went to Alhanpur — Ranthambhor¹²² and sacked the place. Alhanpur, therefore, seems to have been the limit of Bahlūl's empire in the south-west.

It is Ahmad Yādgār again who credits Bahlūl Lodī with leading his army into Nimkhār, now known as Nīmsār.¹²³ Misrik in Hardoi district. His version is corroborated by 'Abdulla. According to 'Abdulla the Sultan plundered the place and depopulated it of "all the riff-raff and undesirable elements".¹²⁴ Yādgār speaks of

— He gives no date for the campaign but says that it was launched when Prince Nizām Khan was five years old. Bahlūl's son Nizām was born in the seventh year of his reign and — expedition should have been led twelve years after Bahlūl's accession, — is, in A. D. 1463. T.S.A., 18-20.

¹¹⁷ Tod, *Annals . . . of Rajasthan*, I, 292.

¹¹⁸ E and D, V, 4-5.

¹¹⁹ I.G., XXIV, 89; Duff, C. I., 288; Hodivala, 485.

¹²⁰ *Udaipur — Itihās*, 639 n. 1.

¹²¹ T.A., I, 313; *Makhzan*, 51 (a).

¹²² T.S.A., 10 has نيمکار and T.D., 25 has نيمکار. E and D, V, 5 somehow has Munkhar. Nimkhār is mentioned elsewhere too in E and D., V, 206 and VI, 123.

The town of Nimkhār or Nīmsār lies on the left bank of river Gomti in Hardoi district. In Akbar's time it was a Mahal in the Sarkar of Khairabad and a shrine of great resort (*Āin*, Trs., II, 172). It is a place of pilgrimage even now.

Hodivala suggests that the place may be the country of Mundhars in the neighbourhood of Sarhind, but the details of the campaign point to Nīmsār in Hardoi district only.

¹²³ T.D., 25. Also T.S.A., 23-27. 'Abdulla places the incident of Nimkhār

Bahlūl's action in Sindh also, but is not supported by any other writer. He says that two or three months after the Nimkhār campaign¹²⁶ ■■■■■ Lodi went to Lahore in response to an appeal from the governor of Multan against whom Ahmad Khan Bhatti, an important chief (Sāhib-i-Jāh), had revolted. A rebellion by the Bhatti chief is possible, but the fantastic narrative of the campaign carries its own refutation. Besides the Langāhs could not possibly have asked for Bahlūl's help to suppress a local rebel when they themselves were strong enough to defeat the army of Delhi and repulse an attack from Malwa.

But all historians write about Bahlūl's campaign against Gwalior during his last days.¹²⁶ From the very beginning of his reign Bahlūl Lodi had maintained friendly relations with the Rajas of Gwalior, because firstly, it was not easy to subjugate them and secondly, it was convenient to keep Gwalior independent to serve as a buffer against the Sharqīs and the kings of Malwa. It was because of Gwalior's friendship to Delhi that Husain Sharqī had invaded it in 1466. But during the last Lodi-Sharqī war the Raja of Gwalior, scared at the rising power of Delhi, had helped Husain with men and money and had escorted him up to Kalpi.¹²⁷ This Bahlūl naturally could not forget. He kept quiet so long as Kalyan Singh lived, but after his death he launched an attack ■■■■■ Gwalior in 1486-7. The newly crowned Raja of Gwalior, Mān Singh, thought it safe to pay eighty lacs of *tanhās* in tribute and avoid an unnecessary conflict with Delhi.¹²⁸

in the beginning of Bahlūl's reign giving the heading "Narrative of another story" (تاریخ داستان دیگر), but he writes it at the end of the account ■■■■■ Bahlūl's reign.

Yādgār puts it after the campaign of Rajputana. T.S.A., 18-20.

¹²⁶ According to Ahmad Yādgār, the Sultan sent Prince Bayasīd with 30,000 horse against Ahmad Khan Bhatti whose nephew Nawrang was defeated in battle. But Nawrang's mistress attired herself in man's suit of mail, attacked, and defeated the royalists. Finally Bayasīd, with the help of the reinforcements rushed from Delhi, defeated and killed Ahmad Khan together with the warrior-girl and his country was annexed to the imperial domain. But we know that during Bahlūl's reign the rulers of Multan were Langāhs and of Sindh Summas, and that Sindh, Multan and most of the western Punjab did not form part of the Lodi empire. T.S.A., 20-23.

¹²⁶ T.A., I, 313; *Makhzan*, 49 (b); *Ferishta*, I, 177; *Badaoni*, I, 312.

¹²⁷ *Makhzan*, 49 (b); T.A., I, 311.

¹²⁸ Bahlūl's contemporaries in Gwalior were Dunga Singh (1440-1453),

From Gwalior, Sultan Bahlūl marched to Dholpur. He defeated its ruler as well as Iqbāl Khan, the governor of Bari,¹²⁰ both of whom paid handsome tribute.¹²⁰ He is also said to have marched to Ujjain and defeated its "Raja",¹²¹ but Malwa then was under Muslim rule and we do not know if there was a Hindu Raja ruling at Ujjain. Yādgār probably has introduced Ujjain only to add glamour to the Sultan's name and the evidence in this regard is as shaky as with regard to the war against the Rana of Mewar.

Bahlūl Lodī's last campaign — directed against Etawah which he took from Shakti Singh,¹²² son of Rai Dandā. It appears that Shakti Singh had taken possession of the place without the Sultan's permission who had earlier settled it on Ibrāhīm Khan, son of Mubārak Khan Nūhānī. From Etawah, Bahlūl took the road to Delhi, but he was not destined to reach there. As he arrived near Bhadauli, now called Milāuli¹²³ and situated at a distance of about 15 miles from Saket in Etah district, he was taken seriously ill and expired there in July, A. D. 1489 (Sh'abān, 894 H) after a strenuous reign of about thirty-nine and a half lunar years.¹²⁴

Kirtī Singh (1468-73), Kalyān Singh (1473-86) and Mān Singh (1486-1517).

¹²⁰ Situated 28 miles west of Delhi.

¹²¹ M.R., I, 451.

¹²² T.S.A., 28.

¹²³ Shakti Singh is not mentioned by Badaonī. Nizāmuddīn and Ferishta call him Sakat Singh سکات سنگھ. It is obviously Shakti Singh of Sanskrit. Col. Ranking suggests that Saket was probably the headquarters of Shakti Singh. Badaonī, Ranking, I, 410, n. 4.

¹²⁴ The — of the place where Bahlūl died — given by Nizāmuddīn as Bilawālī, by Ferishta as Bhadauli, and by 'Abdulla as Jalālī. Badaonī does not give the name, but Col. Ranking adopts Ferishta's "Bhadauli". Col. Ranking adds in a note that Saket is in the Etah district of the N.W. Province and it is here according to Hunter (Imp. Gaz., XII, 146) that Bahlūl Lodī died. Abul Fazl also says that he died — the town of Saketh. Afn, Jarrett, II, 309.

¹²⁵ The length of the reign of Sultan Bahlūl, as in the case of so many others, — wrongly given by our historians as being thirty-eight years, eight months and eight days. T.A., I, 313; Ferishta, I, 179; Badaonī I, 312; Ranking, 410; *Maḥṣaw*, 51 (b); Dorn, 54.

According to these very authorities Bahlūl had ascended the throne on 17 Rabiul Awwal, 855 H and died in 894 H; and since there is — lacuna of time mentioned between Bahlūl's death and Sikandar's accession, in all probability Bahlūl died in Sh'abān, 894 H (July, A. M. 1489). This is the date accepted by Sir Wolsley Haig, who at one place says that the Sultan died in the second

Bahlūl Lodi—An Estimate

The death of Bahlūl Lodi was due to over-exertion. He had died in harness. Throughout his life he had fought to extend the boundaries of his dominions. When he had ascended the throne his kingdom consisted of only 'Az-Dehli-tā-Pālam' territory. He had added to it, by stages, the Punjab and the whole of Uttar Pradesh. In the east his empire extended up to the western frontiers of Bihar, in the south up to Dholpur and in the south-west up to Alhanpur near Ranthambhor. Perhaps during his long reign he could have reclaimed some more territories, but the Saiyyads' incompetency had made his task all the more difficult. The Jaunpur kings had time and again defeated the Saiyyad monarchs and had extended their dominions as far as Shamsābād and Etawah. The result was that it took Bahlūl more than a quarter of a century to destroy the Sharqī power. Indeed, because of his preoccupations against Jaunpur he cruelly neglected the Punjab where his kinsmen began to assume an attitude of independence and created insurmountable problems for his successors. All the same the extinction of the eighty-five-year-old Sharqī kingdom was a great achievement of Bahlūl. It fired the imagination of his contemporaries; and prompted Shaikh Firōz, grandfather of Rizqu'lla Mushtāqī, to write a *masnawī* on the Lodi-Sharqī war.¹³⁴

The Doab was no less difficult to manage. The Rajputs settled in the region between Etah and Etawah on the west and Farrukhabad in the east had formed the backbone of resistance to the Turkish sultans since the inception of Muslim rule in Uttar Pradesh. Timūr's avalanche had swept the Sultanate and set them free. Till the time of Akbar these people more or less remained

week of July, 1489 (C.H.I., III, 235). ■ at another says that he died ■ 17 July, 1489 (*Ibid.*, 304) which would correspond with 18 Sh'abān, 894 H.

Thus the length of Bahlūl's reign according to the lunar calendar would be thirty-nine years, five months and one day. The mistake in the calculation of our historians may be due to two reasons. Firstly, the error of the one was adopted unchecked by the others. Secondly, thirty-eight years, eight months and eight days ■ an alliteration with ■ burden on eight and probably sounded to them so well that they adopted it without laying emphasis on truth.

¹³⁴ E. and D., IV, 533.

unsubdued. A glimpse of their daring life has been given by Abul Fazl. "The people inhabiting the villages round Saket," writes he, "stood unrivalled for their rebellious spirit and ungratefulness; the eye of the age never saw rebels . . . like them. They were not only themselves disorderly but kept the villages and their inhabitants in a state of disorder and they lived a bold sort of life . . ." ¹²⁶ The chiefs of this region, which lay between Delhi and Jaunpur, took every advantage of the Lodi-Sharqi conflict, changed sides at convenience and created constant difficulties for the Sultanate. Bahlul managed them as best as he could, at times by humouring and at others by hammering them. The control of the turbulent chiefs of this region was a great achievement for Bahlul, although the smallness of the area made it hardly appear as an achievement. ¹²⁷

Bahlul Lodi could achieve such ■■■■■ in the political field firstly, because he was a distinguished military leader, and secondly, because he could tactfully manage his turbulent Afghan nobles and channelise their energies for the betterment of the state. About his martial qualities 'Abdulla pays a just tribute. "From the day he (Bahlul) became king," says he, "no one achieved a victory over him; nor did he once leave the field until he had gained the day, or been carried off wounded." ¹²⁸ The statement suffers from exaggeration; but it is a fact that in war Bahlul was as clever as he was courageous. The persistence and consistency with which he fought the Sharqi kings and ultimately annexed their kingdom speaks for his brilliance as an army commander. In victory he was chivalrous. When the queen consort of Husain Sharqi fell into his hands he treated her with respect and sent her back to her husband, knowing full well that she was the one who ■■■ constantly nagging her husband to attack Delhi. For a victorious Muslim sultan in Medieval India, this treatment was unique.

The Sultan was as generous as he was brave. After he had won the day he knew how best to reward his soldiers. When he took possession of Delhi he distributed its treasures among his men, himself taking an equal share with the others. ¹²⁹ And this was his policy with regard to any other spoils of war. He was very keen on

¹²⁶ A.N., Beveridge, II, 253-55.

■■■ Cf. R. P. Tripathi, *Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire*, 21.

¹²⁸ T.D., 12.

¹²⁹ Ferishta, I, 179.

having the best soldiers in his army and placed great reliance on the courage of his Afghan troops. On that account they met with such encouragement that there ■■■ nearly twenty thousand Afghans in his service.

By his tact and ability Bahlūl Lodī won the love and loyalty of the thousands of Afghans under him. As he could not hope for support from the Turks or Indian Muslims, he had invited leaders of Afghan tribes from Roh to defend the honour of the Afghans in India and share the benefits of the new empire. The appeal had met with tremendous response and crowds of Afghans had flocked to his standard entertaining all kinds of hopes. Bahlūl kept his word; he not only rewarded his partisans with wealth and position but gave them an equal status with himself. Even in the Darbar he would not occupy ■ throne but sat only on ■ carpet with the others. Whenever he wrote a *farmān* to his nobles, he always addressed them as "Mas-nad-i-Āli" (Exalted Lordship). If at any time some of them got displeased, he would go to their houses, ungird his sword, remove his turban and lay these before them to pacify them, saying: "If you do not think ■ worthy of the station, you may choose ■ one else".¹⁴⁰ This the Sultan did ■ a matter of policy also. The loyalty of the Afghan nobles used to register kaleidoscopic shiftings. They could always offer the crown to any one of Bahlūl's rivals, and the movements of the Sharqī kings mostly depended on the barometer of the baronial temper. To keep them in good humour and under invisible control, Sultan Bahlūl "kept up a bond of fraternity with the entire body of noblemen".¹⁴¹ ■ in doing so, he reduced the sovereign to the position of *primus inter pares* (Chief among Equals) vis-a-vis the nobles. The weaknesses of the system are quite obvious. It raised the power of the nobles at the expense of the Sultan. It denied the non-Afghans ■ place in the government. It envisaged the Sultan as a leader only of the Afghans; he ceased to be the king of all the people. It made the Afghan tribesmen a privileged class, and the selfish and power-drunk nobility could hardly fail to take advantage of this situation as time passed. In spite of all this, Bahlūl had achieved his aim. His policy of *primus inter pares* had earned him the loyalty of the Afghan tribal leaders

¹⁴⁰ T.D., 11-12; W.M., ■ (a).

¹⁴¹ W.M., 4 (a).

who helped him fight his wars and worked with him ungrudgingly through thick and thin.

Bahlûl's achievements as an administrator were neither commendable nor mean. He possessed inherent qualities which endeared him to all. He devoted great attention to the administration of justice. He himself heard the petitions of his subjects, and did not leave them to be disposed of by his ministers. Withal his dispatch of business was quick.¹⁴³ Religious minded though he was, he was no bigot. Of his important nobles and partisans some illustrious ones were Hindus like Rai Pratap Singh, Rai Karan Singh, Rai Nar Singh, Rai Trilok Chand and Rai Dandu. He was thrifty but not greedy. He did not like the wasteful practices of the Afghans and abolished them.¹⁴⁴ But he accumulated no personal treasure. He executed his kingly functions without ostentation or parade. He could not stand any waste of public money.

As a man Bahlûl was benevolent and courageous, honest and merciful. His intrinsic qualities of mind and heart had marked him out to his uncle Islâm Shâh. He had a deep respect for his religion and great respect for its law. He said his prayers in public five times every day. He was fond of the company of the learned and the wise. His charitable disposition forbade him to turn a suppliant, although he did not encourage beggary.¹⁴⁵ The Sultan was extremely social in his behaviour and met his friends on an equal footing. If any one of his nobles fell ill, he would himself go to attend him. But his circle of friends was so comprehensive as to cover almost the whole court, and every one tried to take advantage of his undue leniency.

Withal Bahlûl's sense of humour was terrible. The story of his seizure of the throne reads like a practical joke played upon Hamîd Khan. Once he had a fling at a student of stunted growth, but when the boy got cross, Bahlûl at once offered his apology.¹⁴⁶ An anecdote of the Sultan's tolerance and sense of humour as given by 'Abdulla needs to be reproduced.¹⁴⁷ Once in the Jama' Masjid, after the prayers, Mulla Fazîl, one of the elders of the city, began to talk irresponsibly of the Afghans. "We have an extraordinary tribe of rulers," said he, "I do not know whether they are the

¹⁴³ Ferishta, I, 179.

¹⁴⁴ W.M., 4 (a).

¹⁴⁵ T. D., 12; W.M., 4 (a).

¹⁴⁶ W.M., 4 (a).

¹⁴⁷ T.D., 11. Also W.M., 4 (a & b).

servants of arch-fiends ~~or~~ arch-fiends themselves. Their language is so barbarous. . . ." While the Mulla was thus railing, Bahlûl only smiled and said, "Mulla Fazîl, hold, enough, for we are all servants of God".

Such was the first Afghan ruler of Delhi. In a word he "was wise, considerate, kind, friendly, humble and just".¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁷ T.D., II; W.M., 4 (a).

Also T.A., I, 299; *Ferishta*, I, 179.

Chapter 9

EFFORTS AT STABILITY

BAHLŪL LODI's sudden death in camp provided an opportunity to the Afghan nobles to push forward the claims of their favourite princes for the throne. Bahlūl had nine sons,¹ of whom (since Khwājā Bayezīd the eldest had pre-deceased his father), Nizām Khan, Bārbak Shāh, 'Ālam Khan and Fatḥ Khan were possible claimants. Before marching to Gwalior the late Sultan, pleased with Nizām Khan's work against the rebels of the Punjab and Multan, had appointed him to the charge of Delhi and had also nominated him as the heir-apparent.² But about the time of his death some influential Lodi Amīrs prevailed upon the king to nominate as his successor his grandson Āzam Humayūn, son of Khwājā Bayezīd and governor of Kalpi. Unable to resist their solicitation Sultan Bahlūl sent for Nizām Khan from Delhi to convey to him his eleventh hour decision. But 'Umar Khan Sarwani, the Vazīr, who was not a party to this choice, sent word to Nizām warning him not to leave Delhi. The prince, therefore, delayed his departure and meanwhile Bahlūl died at Milauli near Saket.

In the camp the nobles who did not want Nizām Khan began to discuss the question of succession with all earnestness and heat, since now an immediate choice had to be made. According to Ferishta some of them were in favour of Āzam Humayūn while some others wanted Bārbak Shāh, the eldest surviving son of Bahlūl.³ While they were thus deliberating Nizām Khan's mother queen Zeba,⁴ who was watching the proceedings from behind the curtain, addressed the assembly and pleaded for Nizām's claims.

¹ T.A., I, 298. Also De's trs., 337 and n. 3. Ferishta, I, 174.

² T.D., 31-35; T.S.A., 31-34; W.M., 9-10. ³ Ferishta, I, 179.

⁴ According to Yādgār her name was Hāmā, according to Ferishta, Zeba and according to Ni'amatulla, Ambha. This lady was a goldsmith's daughter, Yādgār describing her beauty says that her face was like tulip and her hair black as jet. Bahlūl was attracted by her beauty while he was governor of Sarhind. He married her after ascending the throne of Delhi. T.S.A., 17; Ferishta, I, 179.

But 'Isa Khan Lodi, son of Tātār Khan Lodi, and cousin of Nizām, snubbed her saying: "The [] of a goldsmith's daughter was not fit to be the king as it is proverbial that monkeys make but bad carpenters". His insolence towards the widowed queen annoyed Khan-i-Khānān who rebuked 'Isa Khan. An altercation between the two only strengthened Khan-i-Khānān's support for Nizām. He took his party to Jalālī, 11 miles from Kol, together with the corpse of the deceased monarch and summoned Nizām Khan there. Intrigued at the situation, the prince consulted Qutluḡ Khan, the Sharqī Vazīr, who after his capture had been won over and was living at Delhi, and on the latter's advice Nizām started post-haste for Jalālī. His arrival there disarmed his opponents who left for their respective fiefs. He sent his father's body to Delhi to be interred there, [] with the support of Khan-i-Jahān, Khan-i-Khānān Farmūlī and the majority of the nobles² he ascended the throne on Friday 17 July, 1489 (18 Sh'abān, 894 H)³ in the palace of Firōz Shāh on the bank of the Kālī Nadi,⁴ with the title of Sikandar Shāh.

Suppression of Rivals

After celebrating his accession in a befitting manner⁵ the new Sultan repaired to Delhi.⁶ He had not waded through blood to

¹ *Makhzan*, 51 (b).

² T.A., I, 314; Badaoni, I, 313; Ferishta, I, 179; T.S.A., 34-5; T.D., 36; and *Khuldsat-ul-Tawārīkh*, 273.

Dorn, 35 has 7 Sh'abān which was Monday [] not Friday. *Makhzan*, 52 (b) correctly has 17.

³ Nizāmuddīn, and Badaoni have [] Nadi. Also T. D., 36 and T.S.A., 34-5. But Ferishta, I, 179 [] Beah.

Rizqulla, W.M., [] (b), puts it very clearly. در نواحی جلال در کنار آب کالی ن ک.

لیا کر شک سلطان فیروز شاه اسد میان نظام بر تخت سلطنت کامکاری کامرائی کرد.

(In the vicinity of Jalālī, on the bank of the (river) Kālī Nadi, where there is a palace of Sultan Firōz Shāh, Mīan Nizām ascended the throne of the Sultanate.)

⁴ Dorn, 35; T.S.A., 35.

⁵ According to 'Abdulla and Ahmad Yādgar he immediately marched to Bayana and according to Ferishta against 'Isa Khan Lodi. But they do not [] to be correct as later events would show. T.D., 48; T.S.A., 36-37; Ferishta, I, 179.

the throne, but his opponents were strong and not yet reconciled. There were three potential rivals to be dealt with: (a) Āzam Humayūn, governor of Kalpi and son of the Sultan's brother Khwājā Bayezīd, (b) his elder brother Bārbak Shāh ruler of Jaunpur and (c) his brother 'Ālam Khan, governor of Rapri, who had asserted his independence by assuming the royal title.

Sikandar Lodī first marched against his younger brother 'Ālam Khan. The latter shut the gates of Rapri but, unable to stand a siege, fled to 'Īsa Khan at Patiali.¹⁰ Sikandar conferred Rapri on Khan-i-Khānān Farmūlī and himself marched to Etawah where he stayed for seven months sending feelers to 'Ālam Khan to come over to his side. At last the Sultan succeeded in weaning away his brother from 'Īsa Khan's side by giving him the governorship of Etawah. Thereupon he marched to Patiali and Shamsābād. 'Īsa had opposed Sikandar's candidature, and was prepared for the worst. He fought like a man but was defeated and after succumbed to his injuries received in the battle.¹¹ The government of Patiali was conferred upon Rai Ganesh.¹² This was a diplomatic move. Ganesh was a partisan of Bārbak Shāh in the east and by this gesture was won over to Sikandar's side.

From Patiali, the Sultan led his forces against his more formidable rival, Bārbak Shāh. He had sincerely wished to avoid a war with his brother, but in vain. Bārbak was ruling independently at Jaunpur ever since A. D. 1486 (892 H) with his own Khutba and coinage, but the legend on it shows that he was all obedience to his father.¹³ Sikandar had been lenient to his brother 'Ālam Khan and had reconciled with 'Īsa Khan before the latter died of his injuries.¹⁴ He, therefore, felt that Bārbak would learn a lesson from his liberal attitude and insert Sikandar's name in the Khutba and coinage of Jaunpur. On furnishing this proof of loyalty he was to be left undisturbed. But when Ism'ail Khan Nūhānī carried the suggestion

¹⁰ Dorn, 55.

¹¹ T.A., I, 319; Ferishta, I, 180; Mahāsan, 52 (b).

¹² Badaoni, I, 314.

¹³ Thomas, 377. On his coins he is mentioned as the *naib* (Deputy) of the Amirul Ma'mūnīn (used for Delhi Sultans and Indo-Muslim coins) of Jaunpur. On one side *بارك شاه سلطان* (Bārbak Sultan). On the other *نائب أمير المؤمنين* (Naib Amirul Ma'mūnīn, in the city of Jaunpur, 892 H).

¹⁴ Mahāsan, 52 (b).

to Bārbak Shāh, the latter refused to comply.¹⁵ Not only that; instigated by some Afghan chiefs and secret intrigues of the exiled Husain Sharqī, he began to make preparations for war. This Sikandar could hardly tolerate and marched towards Jaunpur.

Bārbak Shāh also left Jaunpur with his army to meet his brother. On the way he was joined by Miān Muhammad Khan Farmūlī (also known as Kālā Pahār), Sikandar's sister's son and governor of Avadh and Bahraich. The contending forces met near Qannauj. After great slaughter¹⁶ Bārbak Shāh was defeated and his two trusted partisans Mubārak Khan Nūhānī and Muhammad Khan Farmūlī fell into the hands of Sikandar Shāh. The sultan treated Kālā Pahār well that he was not only won over to his side,¹⁷ but turned his sword against Bārbak. This sudden *volte face* of his supporter so completely demoralised Bārbak Shāh that he fled to Badaoni, but was eventually compelled to sue for peace. Sikandar treated him well, took him back to Jaunpur and reinstated him there. However, he assigned the *parganas* around Jaunpur to his trusted officers as a check upon the activities of Bārbak as well as of Husain Shāh Sharqī who was still lurking in Bihar.¹⁸

The third rival Āzam Humayūn now hardly possessed any courage to oppose the Sultan, so that when Sikandar marched from Jaunpur to Kalpi, he just relieved Āzam Humayūn of it and conferred it on Mahmūd Khan Lodī.

With the suppression of his rivals, Sikandar Shāh was left the sole master of Hindustan. He was a mature man of a little over thirty at the time of his accession.¹⁹ As a child he had been precocious. Loved by his father, he had received an excellent education. In administration he was trained by Qutluḡ Khan, the talented

¹⁵ Dorn, 56; T.D., 48 ■■■ T.S.A., 37 say that he was informed of Bārbak's attitude ■■■ at Delhi.

¹⁶ Dorn, 56. ¹⁷ Ferishta, I, 180; *Makhzan*, 53 (a).

¹⁸ T.A., I, 316; Badaoni, I, 314; Ferishta, I, 180; T.D., 48-49; T.S.A., 37-38. Dorn, 56. *Makhzan*, 53 (a-b); M.R., I, 454.

¹⁹ 'Abdulla says that Sikandar was 18 years of age at the time of his accession, but he is incorrect. Almost all chroniclers say that he was born in the seventh year of Bahlūl's reign. Bahlūl ascended the throne in 1451 and ■■■ Sikandar must have been born in 1457 or 1458. In 1489 he would have been thirty-one. That he was advanced in age is confirmed by Nizāmud-dīn and Nizāmud-dīn who say that Sikandar had six sons at the time of his accession.

Vazir of Jaunpur and in arms by commanders like Dariyā Khan Nūhānī and Khan-i-Khānān Farmūlī. As he grew up he ■■■ given Sambhal as his personal jagir. Later ■■■ he was appointed governor of Sarhind. During the last days of Bahlūl, Tātār Khan of Lahore and Saif Khan of Multan, who had rebelled, were successfully defeated by him.²⁰ Bahlūl was so immensely pleased with the prince's exploits that before marching on his last campaign to Gwalior he had given him the charge of Delhi and nominated him as his heir-apparent.

Born of a beautiful woman, Sikandar was extremely handsome. Although resentful of the unhealthy attentions of Shaikh Hasan, grandson of Shaikh Abu Lala of Rapri²¹ towards his "beauty", he ■■■ conscious of his charming personality and his pen-name of Gulrukhī (Rose-faced) was perhaps not adopted just by accident. Ascending the throne at an advanced age, his habits and temperament had been set, and the prominent features of his character were well known. He cared little for magnificence ■■■ ostentation. Courage, liberality and politeness were his assets.²² Bigotry, which developed with age, too was not absent in his early days. Before his accession he had expressed a keen desire to go to Kurukshetra to destroy the infidels who had assembled there during a bathing festival. When Miān 'Abdulla Ajodhanī protested against his striking at a time-honoured custom, the prince flew into a rage.²³ Stories about the new Sultan's love of justice were also quite current.²⁴

To resume. Having done away with his last rival at Kalpi, Sikandar Lodī moved westward. Tātār Khan, the governor of Jathara,²⁵ near Gwalior, came to pay him homage. The Sultan next moved towards Gwalior and sent Khwājā Muhammad Farmūlī with a special robe to Raja Mān Singh. The latter reciprocated the

²⁰ W.M., 9 (b); T.S.A., 31; T.D., 32.

²¹ T.D., 28-30; T.S.A., 29-30; W.M., 12 (a). For Shaikh Hasan's life ■■■ *Khandīn-ul-Sūfīa*, I, 409 and *Ahādīn-ul-Ahlyār*, 167.

²² T.D., 32-36; T.S.A., 31-34.

²³ T.D., 30-31; T.S.A., 30; W.M., 7(b)-8(a). ■■■ T.S.A., 35-36.

²⁴ T.A., I, 315 has Jathra جاثرا or Jathara. So has M.R., I, 436. Col. Ranking, Badaoni, I, Trs., 414 n. 3 also calls it Jathra having adopted it from Ferishta, I, 180 line 18. The place is not traceable now, but in Akbar's time there ■■■ a pargana bearing this name near Gwalior and included in the Sarkar of Iraj. *Ām.*, II, 188.

gesture of friendship and sent his nephew to attend on the Sultan. The prince accompanied Sikandar Shāh up to Bayana.

At that time Bayana was a walled city with a flourishing trade. It had become independent under Shams Khan Auhadī at the end of the fourteenth century. A buffer principality between the Sultanates of Delhi and Malwa, it continued to remain so for about a hundred years under the Auhadī (later changed to Jalwānī) house. Afraid of Delhi's encroachment, Bayana had leaned for support on Malwa, or failing it, on Jaunpur—both rivals of Delhi. When during his last days Bahlūl Lodi had marched through Bayana to Alhanpur ■■■ Ranthambhor, Sher Khan, governor of Chanderi, a dependency of Bayana, had thrown him back. Sikandar Lodi's success in consolidating his power obliged Bayana's ruler Sultan Sharf, son of Ahmad Khan Jalwānī, to acknowledge his authority. But Sharf had earlier ill-treated Bahīl and removed his name from the Khutba, and Sikandar did not want to let him go unpunished. He therefore asked Sharf to give up Bayana in exchange for Jalesar, Chandwār, Marehra and Saket.²⁶ Sharf agreed to the proposal, took 'Umar Sarwānī with him to deliver the keys of the fort, but once back in the citadel he changed his mind. Sikandar Shāh had in the meantime proceeded towards Agra, a dependency of Bayana,²⁷ then held by Haibat Khan Jalwānī. Haibat Khan also barred the gates of Agra against the Sultan. He besieged Agra, left some Amirs to continue the siege, and himself returned to Bayana and captured it in A. D. 1492 (898 H).²⁸ Bayana was conferred upon Khan-i-Khānān Farmūlī, the Sultan's guardian in youth, and Sultan Sharf, who would have been wiser to keep his word, was chased out of it. The Sultan then returned to Delhi.

The Baghosis

The Sultan had been in a camp for long and needed rest badly.

²⁶ T.A., I, 316; Ferishta, I, 180; M.R., I, 435. Marehra is a town in ■■■ District, 27° 44' N., 78° ■' E. Dist. Gaz. U.P., XII, 187.

²⁷ *Mahzan*, 34 (a).

²⁸ T.A., I, 316; Ferishta, I, 180; Badaoni, I, 315 and *Mahzan*, ■ (a) have 897 H. But Dorn, 56 and C.I.S.G., I, 233 have 898 H and they are correct. Jaunpur's rebellion was suppressed in 899 ■ and Sikandar Shāh marched to it immediately after the capture of Bayana.

But only twenty-four days²⁰ after his arrival at the capital he had to rush to the east where the Bachgotis were reported to be creating disturbances. The Bachgotis were a tribe of turbulent Rajputs descended from the Mainpuri Chauhans.²¹ Their leader was Jūgā.²² At the instigation of Husain Sharqi he collected a large force of a hundred thousand horse and foot²³ and rose in revolt in the east. The Bachgotis drove out Mubārak Khan, governor of Kara, killed his brother Sher Khan and frightened Bārbak Shāh into hurrying to KILĀ Pahār at Dariyābād.²⁴ Raja Bhēd (Bhōdachandra) of Bhatghora (Rewa),²⁵ who also seems to have been in league with the rebels, attacked Mubārak Khan Nūhānī when the latter was crossing at the ferry of Jhusi, a small town across the Ganga opposite Allahabad, and imprisoned him.

Enraged at the activities of the Bachgotis, Sikandar Lodi started for the east and within a week arrived at Dalmau, a town of great antiquity lying opposite Kara, in A.D. 1493 (early 899 H).²⁶ His arrival had a salutary effect. Bārbak Shāh hurried to join him. Raja Bhēd, overawed, released Mubārak Nūhānī who also repaired to the Sultan. Their joint forces defeated the Bachgotis on the bank of the Gomti. The rebels were cut down and dispersed and much booty fell into the hands of the Sultan's men, but Jūgā escaped to join Husain Sharqi in the fort of Chaund.²⁷ Sikandar tried to win over

²⁰ T.A., I, 317; Ferishta, I, 180.

²¹ Elliot, *Races of North Western Provinces*, I, 47-49. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 414-15 and n. 13.

The Bachgotis (or Basingotis as they are called now) are still found in large numbers in the Allahabad-Jaunpur region.

²² T.D., 50; T.S.A., 38; W.M., 10 (a & b).

²³ T.A., I, 317; T.D., 50; T.S.A., 38; Badaoni, I, 315.

²⁴ In Barebanki dist., U.P., situated between Lucknow and Gonda. Dist. Gaz. U.P., XLVIII, 197-98.

²⁵ All the texts have Raja Bhēd of Panna. Ferishta, I, 180 has Ral Sehdeva of Thatta. He is other than Raja Bhōdachandra, the Baghela Raja of Bhatghora = Rewa.

²⁶ *Makhzan*, 54 (b).

²⁷ T.D., 50; W.M., 10 (b). N.B. Roy identifies the place as Chanda, a village in Sultanpur, 25 miles from it. Roy, *Nizamulla's History of the Afghans*, 139.

But he is not correct. Chaund is a large Pargana with a fort, and is included in modern Chajnpur, near Bhabua, in Shahabad district, (north) Bihar. Also see *Jour. Bihar Research Society*, XLI, 1955, Pt. II, 360.

Husain by inviting him to jointly fight the "infidel rebels" but on receiving a rebuff attacked him. Husain Sharqi gave a determined fight at Katghar (in Distt. Rae Bareilly), but he was defeated and fled back towards Bihar.³⁷ The Sultan ——— thoroughly disgusted at the incompetence of Bārbak Shāh in holding Jaunpur, and bestowed it upon Mubārak Khan Mujikhal.³⁸ Bārbak was imprisoned and left in charge of Haibat Khan and 'Umar Khan Sarwānī.

Sultan Sikandar then proceeded to Chunār but encountering a determined opposition from the officers of Husain Sharqi,³⁹ he diverted westward to Baghela or Bhata country. According to Ferishta the Raja of Bhata ——— to wait upon him at Kantī,⁴⁰ but distrustful of his intentions, fled away at night. In revenge the Sultan ravaged Arail opposite Allahabad,⁴¹ and then returned to Delhi via Kara, Dalmā and Sambhal.

The Baghelas of Rewa

Next year, A.D. 1494-5 (900 H), Sikandar Lodī started to teach a lesson to the Baghela Raja Bhēdachandra of Bhatghora.⁴² Not much is known about the early history of this house. It appears that after the extinction of Baghela rule in Gujarat by 'Alāuddin Khālji in 1299, the Baghelas quitted Gujarat ~~en masse~~ and settled down in the region round Banda and Kalinjar. About two centuries later their ruler Virama Deva was so hard pressed by the chieftains of Kalpi and Jaunpur, that his successor Raja Bhēdachandra moved to the country now called Baghelkhand bounded by the Kaimūr ranges on the north and north-west and by the Maikāl ranges on the

³⁷ T.D., 50-53; T.S.A., 38-40; W.M., 11 (b). T.A. and Ferishta do not give any narrative of the fight with Husain Sharqi.

³⁸ T.A., I, 321. Also Ferishta, I, 182.

³⁹ T.A., I, 318; Ferishta, I, 181; Dorn, 57.

⁴⁰ On the S.W. bank of Ganga in the Sarkar of Allahabad. Āfn, Jarrett, II, 89; 158. It is now in Mirzapur distt. on the road from Allahabad to Rewa, 16 miles south of the former. Its chiefs are known as Rajas of Bijapur.

⁴¹ Arail, like Jhūsi, lies just opposite Prayag near Naini Railway station. It is now called Jalalabad.

⁴² Gahora or Ghora, which was the capital of Bhata, is now a forsaken village, about 12 miles east of Karvi in Banda district.

south and the south-west. According to the Sanskrit *Mahākāvya Virbhānudayā* of Madhava,⁴³ Bhēdachandra extended his authority along the line of the Ganga up to Kantit on the west and up to Gaya in south Bihar in the east.⁴⁴ His capital ■■■ Bandūgarh. The Lodi-Sharqi strife had ensured the safety of the Baghelas, but then the loss of Sharqi power threatened to disturb the political balance. Consequently Raja Mān of Gwalior and Raja Bhēd of Bhata helped Husain Sharqi after his crushing defeat at Sonhār. Again in 1493 when the Bachgotis were instigated by Husain Sharqi to revolt, Bhēdachandra colluded with them and imprisoned Mubārak Khan Nūhānī. Having failed in his opposition to the Sultan, he thought of making amends by meeting Sikandar at Kantit, but the cloud between the two could not be lifted and Sikandar Lodi launched a campaign against Baghelkhand in 1495.

The Sultan put the countryside to fire and sword. On arrival at Kharan Ghati⁴⁵ he was encountered by Vahārārāya Deva,⁴⁶ son of Bhēdachandra. The prince ■■■ defeated and he was forced to vacate his capital. They fled towards Sarguja⁴⁷ but Vahārārāya died on the way and the father followed suit because of the shock. At this Sikandar Lodi gave up their pursuit and returned to Bandūgarh.⁴⁸ He had enjoyed devastating the countryside, but now he paid for it. Provisions became ■ scarce that ■ salt ■ difficult to obtain.

⁴³ Written in the sixteenth century and translated in abridgement by Hiranand Shastri in the Archaeological Survey of India, Memoir No. 21, 1925.

⁴⁴ Arch. Sur. Memoir, No. 21, 6.

⁴⁵ T.A., I, 317 has کارن کھائی and Ferishta, I, 181 کارن دکائی. *Mahāsan*, ■ (b) has Kahāl while Dorn has Gungauni, 58.

■ He is called Bīr Singh Deo and Narsingh Deo in Persian annals, but *Virbhānudayā* gives the above name.

⁴⁷ Sarguja ■ Ambikapur, one of the former Eastern States, lies about 32 miles S.E. of Daltongung in Chhotanagpur.

⁴⁸ Because of the varied spellings of this name in the Persian texts (Ferishta, I, 181; T.A., I, 317; *Mahāsan*, 56 (a)) ■ Wolseley Haig, (C.H.I., III, 237), has got it wrong ■ Phāphāmau.

This is not the insignificant village of Phāphāmau near Allahabad but Behavand or Bandhu, which had a strong fort Bandūgarh, Lat. 23° 27' N., Long. 81° 3' E. During a later campaign our chroniclers do write the correct ■ of Bandu or Bandūgarh, about 90 miles S.S.E. from Panna, commonly referred to by our historians, and 50 miles South of Rewa.

Also I.G., VI, 358-59; Ranking, I, 417 and n. 7. Rennel's map in *Memoir of a Map of Hindustan*.

Besides an epidemic carried away many of his men and ninety per cent of his horse and he was forced to retreat.⁴⁰

Lakshmi Chand, son of Bhōdachandra, was not slow to take advantage of this situation. He sent an urgent invitation to Husain Sharqī to strike at the enemy in distress. Husain collected a force in Bihar including a hundred elephants,⁴¹ crossed the Ganga at Kantit and arrived near Varanasi. When he was at a distance of fifteen kos⁴² from Varanasi he ■■■■ messengers to Sālivāhan, brother and successor of Bhōdachandra, asking for his help. But Sikandar in the meantime had won over Sālivāhan,⁴³ who, afraid lest Lakshmi Chand after victory should lay claim to the throne, readily accepted the Sultan's offer of friendship. Reinforced by Sālivāhan, Sikandar met Husain in battle near Varanasi and inflicted a crushing defeat ■■ him. Husain Sharqī fled towards Bihar, but now Sikandar was determined to put an end to his constant pin-pricks once for all. He gave Husain hot pursuit and chased him out of Bihar. Husain went to Colgong,⁴⁴ situated within the kingdom of Lakhnauti, and sought shelter with Sultan Husain Shāh of Bengal (A.D. 1493-1518).⁴⁵ Sikandar consolidated his hold on

⁴⁰ *Makhzan*, 56 (a). T.A., I, 319; *Ferishta*, I, 181; Dorn, 58.

⁴¹ So have T.A., I, 319; E and D.V., 95. *Ferishta*, 181, has a few elephants.

⁴² T.A., I, 319 has ■■■■ *Surah*, *Badsoni*, *Ni'amatulla* and 'Abdulla have 15 ■■■■; E and D, V, T.D., 59.

⁴³ *Ferishta*, I, 181, *Makhzan*, 56 (a) and all other Persian writers have son of Rai Bhōd. So has Dorn, 58. But Sālivāhan was the brother of Bhōdachandra. See *Memoir of Arch. Sur. Ind.*, No. 21. See also *Jour. Bihar & Orissa Research Society*, 1930. Suppl. article.

⁴⁴ It is given as Khulgaon in T.A. and *Ferishta* and Kahlgaon in T.D., 69-70. It is Colgong now in Bhagalpur district, Lat. 25° 13' N. Long. 87° 17' E. about 25 miles east of Bhagalpur town. Constable 19 B.C.

⁴⁵ During the reign of Ahmad Shāh ■■■■ Bengal (1431-1442) Ibrāhīm Sharqī of Jaunpur invaded Bengal. Ahmad Shāh ■■■■ 'Abdul Karīm Hāji to Shāh Rukh, the successor of Timūr residing at Herat, with an appeal for help. The ambassador was received ■■■■ Shāh Rukh ■■■■ Maulānā 'Abdul Rahim with a letter to Sultan Ibrāhīm. The latter received the letter with much respect and never afterwards invaded Bengal, and the relations of Jaunpur and Bengal remained cordial thereafter. The letter is cited in *Ferishta* and the circumstances of the embassy are given in the *Mulla's S'adain*.

It may not be out of place here to continue the activities of the Iranian ambassador. He went to ■■■■ from Bengal, but ■■■■ shipwrecked in the vicinity of Calicut. ■■■■ was hospitably received by the Zamorin, who along

Bihar⁵⁵ and obliged the chiefs of Sāran and Tirhut to acknowledge his suzerainty. The Sultan then proceeded to Colgong but retreated on obtaining an assurance from the king of Bengal that he would not help Hussain Shāh against Sikandar.⁵⁶ After appointing Āzam Humayūn, son of Khan-i-Jahān, as governor of Darveshpur (situated near Maner) and Dariyā Khan Nūhānī as governor of Bihar, Sikandar Shāh returned to Jaunpur.

Sikandar Lodi's friendship with Sālīvāhan, born out of necessity of dealing with Hussain Sharqī, was snapped as soon as the Sultan had gained his end. His original plan was to [redacted] the kingdom. Therefore, three years later, in A.D. 1499 (409 H),⁵⁷ he once again marched against Baghelkhand. The excuse was Sālīvāhan's refusal to enter into a matrimonial alliance with him. He forced his way across the defiles to Bandūgarh, sacking and pillaging, and so devastated its environs that he "blotted out all traces of cultivation".⁵⁸ He again suffered for his reckless action, for scarcity of provisions forced him to vacate the country. The rulers of Bandūgarh continued to rule independently, but repeated Afghan invasions affected its prosperity and crippled its strength.⁵⁹

Thus by 1499 Sikandar Lodi had finally succeeded in crushing all opposition in the east and had annexed Bihar. With Hussain Sharqī's death in Bengal in A.D. 1500 (905 H)⁶⁰ the remotest apprehension of danger from that quarter also eliminated. The country from Bihar to Bayana had been completely brought under control. South of the Ganga the Raja of Bhata had been rendered harmless and other rebellious elements had been put down. Sikandar Shāh now thought of subjugating the western region. He began by settling matters with the powerful kingdom of Gwalior.

with the Iranian sent an envoy to the court of Herat. It was to repay this compliment that Shāh Rukh sent in A. D. 1442 (846 H) Maulānā 'Abdurrazzāq [redacted] Calicut, whence he was invited to Vijāyanagar of which he has given a graphic account in the *Mullaṁ S'adain*. [redacted] *Annual Asiatic Register* of 1800. Also Stewart, *History of Bengal*, 96-99. ⁵⁵ *Makhzan*, 56 (b); T.D., 69-70.

⁵⁶ T.A., I, 319; *Makhzan*, 57 (a); T.D., 58-60; Ferishta, I, 181.

⁵⁷ *Makhzan*, 57 (b). ⁵⁸ *Makhzan*, 57 (b).

⁵⁹ For the first quarter of the sixteenth century Bandūgarh had hardly any history. In 1527 its Raja Bīr Singh joined the camp of Rana Sanga at the battle of Kanuah. Subsequently he attached himself to Bābur.

⁶⁰ Lane-poole, *The Muhammadan Dynasties*, 304, 309.

The Tomars of Gwalior

Gwalior had remained under Muslim occupation ever since its conquest by Iltutmish in 1232 up to the end of the fourteenth century when, taking advantage of the Sultanate's weakness, Vir Singh, a Tomar chief, gained possession of the fortress. Thereafter, in spite of the Saiyyad rulers' pressure and the aggressive attitude of the Sharqi kings and Bahlul Lodi, the principality continued to grow in strength under its Tomar rulers Dungar Singh, Kirti Singh and Kalyan Singh. Dungar Singh even felt strong enough to attack the Narwar fort, then acknowledging the authority of the Malwa sultan, Hoshang Shah. The latter, however, foiled this attempt by a diversionary attack on Gwalior fort. Dungar's reign has become notable for two achievements: firstly, for the Jain sculptures on the Gwalior rock and secondly, for his present of certain musical works to Zainul Abidin of Kashmir.⁶¹ After him his successor Kirti Singh kept the Gwalior territory intact despite the attempted aggression of Bahlul Lodi and Husain Sharqi. But the greatest ruler of this house was Raja Man Singh (1486-1517).

Man Singh was a veritable genius. He was great in war and still greater in peace. Because of his extremely liberal religious views, he was popular with both Hindus and Muslims, so much so that according to Nizamutulla he was "taken to be a Muslim by the Muslims and a Hindu by the Hindus". The chronicler also avers that it was because of his popularity and friendship with the Muslims, that no Muslim ruler could gain ascendancy over him.⁶²

Sikandar Lodi was angry with Man Singh for giving shelter to an important nobleman of the Punjab whom the Sultan had banished. The hold of the Lodis on the Punjab was precarious. During his last days Bahlul had to face a difficult situation there. The reason was that the Punjab was held by the Afghan relations and dependents of the Lodis of Delhi, but they were not unconditionally loyal or obedient to the latter, and Bahlul and Sikandar "were content with such acknowledgement of their supremacy as was indicated by occasional remittances of tribute or revenue".⁶³

⁶¹ T.A., De's Trs., III, 659-60; Mohibbul Hasan, *op. cit.*, 73.

⁶² *Makhzan*, 78 (b).

⁶³ C.H.I., III, 241.

They were not asked, perhaps because they were not willing, to provide large contingents for the subjugation of Hindustan. Otherwise the kingdom of Jaunpur would not have taken as much as three decades to subdue. In A.D. 1500 Sa'id Khan Sarwānī, governor of Lahore, came to pay his respects to the Sultan but, according to Ni'amatulla,⁶⁴ he and Asghar, *hāmīn* of Delhi, together with twenty members of the military aristocracy joined in a plot to raise Sikan-dar's brother Fat'h Khan to the throne. The Prince himself divulged the plot and the conspirators were punished with imprisonment and exile. Asghar was jailed and Sa'id Khan Sarwānī along with his associates like Tātār Khan and Muhammad Shāh were banished. They fled to Gwalior, where, in keeping with the traditions of medieval hospitality, they were given shelter by Mān Singh. But to avoid a crisis in his relations with Delhi, the Raja sent one Nihāl with presents and tributes to the Sultan, who, unprepared for a compromise, sent the envoy back in rage with threats of coming to reduce Gwalior.⁶⁵ Refuge to fugitives, a common excuse for declaration of hostilities in medieval times, was there indeed, but Sikan-dar's real intention was expansionist; the country from Bihar to Bayana had been brought under control and now Gwalior should also be annexed.

The Sultan began with an attack on Dholpur, a dependency of Gwalior, lying 34 miles south of Agra and 37 miles northwest of Gwalior,⁶⁶ and ruled by Vināyak Dēva. 'Ālam Khan from Mewat, Khan-i-Khānān from Rapri, and Khawās Khan from Delhi were ordered to converge on Dholpur. Their combined attack was too much for the small fort of Dholpur, but Vināyak Dēva⁶⁷ gave a tough fight in which a large number of royalists were killed,⁶⁸ including the veteran warrior Khwājā Babban. At this the Sultan himself left for the site of action on 26 March, A.D. 1501 (6 Ramzān, 906 H).⁶⁹ His arrival unnerved Vināyak Dēva who fled to Gwalior

⁶⁴ *Makhzan*, 58 (a)–59(b).

⁶⁵ T.A., I, 323; *Ferishta*, I, 183; T.D., 68; M.R., I, 462.

⁶⁶ Hunter, *Imp. Gaz.*, IV, 273.

⁶⁷ *Ferishta* and a MS. of T.A. clearly have *بایک دهر* (See note 1 in T.A., De, 370). Only *Makhzan*, (a) and Dorn, 61 have *Manik Doo*, which, with slight variation in Persian, will be *Bināyak* or *Vināyak*.

⁶⁸ *Badaoni*, I, 318.

⁶⁹ T. A., I, 324; *Ferishta*, I, 183; Dorn, 61, *Makhzan*, 60 (a).

and the garrison surrendered. Sikandar plundered the place so that trees and orchards extending to fourteen miles around Dholpur were "torn up from the roots". Houses and temples were destroyed and mosques built.⁷⁰

After about a month the Sultan left Dholpur in charge of Ādam Khan Lodī and himself started for Gwalior. Crossing the river Chambal he encamped on the bank of the Asi, otherwise called Mandaki.⁷¹ There, because of shallow water in the river, an epidemic, probably cholera, broke out in the camp and took a heavy toll in lives. Raja Mān of Gwalior thought it a good opportunity to come to terms with the Sultan. He sent his son Vikramāditya with presents to Sikandar and promised to expel Sa'īd Khan, Babū Khan and Rai Ganēsh on the condition that Dholpur would be returned to Vināyak Dēva. In face of the difficulties he was confronting, Sikandar Lodī readily agreed to these terms, and returned to Bayana via Dholpur where he reinstated Vināyak Dēva.⁷² Although the narrative of the chroniclers is as usual flattering to the Sultan, yet it appears that Gwalior had successfully resisted the Lodī attack for more than a year and Vināyak Dēva had not lost Dholpur after all.

This initial failure kept the Sultan away from the Gwalior region for the next four years. The offensive was resumed in February, 1504 (Ramzān, 910 H)⁷³ when Sikandar Lodī marched against the fortress of Mandrael. The Tomars had built a strong line of fortresses all round Gwalior, and the Sultan's plan now seems to have been to reduce these citadels to force Gwalior into surrender. Mandrael was situated on a round hill twelve miles S. S. East of Karauli and two miles distant from the western bank of the Chambal.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ *Makhzan*, 55 (a); *Ferishta*, I, 183; *T.A.*, I, 324; *T.D.*, 58.

⁷¹ Asi is nothing else than the modern Asūn or Ashin flowing west of Gwalior. Mandaki on *T.A.* is very near to the Sanskrit Manduki which means frog-hunted. Ranking, *Badaoni*, I, 418 writes a note on it. In Rennel's map the river is indicated, but is given no name.

⁷² *M.R.*, I, 454; *Makhzan*, 60 (b); *T.A.*, I, 325; *Ferishta*, I, 183.

⁷³ *Makhzan*, 60 (b).

⁷⁴ *Tieffenthaler*, I, 174. The place is not in Rennel's Map. Ranking spells it as Maudalayer. In Keith Johnson's *Atlas* it is Mandler. Āin, Jarret, II, 190 has Mandfair.

It was the chief town of a Sarkar in Sūba Agra. Also see note 5 by Ranking, *Badaoni*, I, 420; *Constable* 27 cb; *I.G. Atlas*, 34 E 2.

The fort was easily taken but, ■ was the Sultan's habit, he sacked and plundered the country to earn the "felicity of a holy war". Indiscriminate killing and destruction resulted in the outbreak of "typhus and other bad diseases"⁷⁶ and many of his men lost their lives. Leaving Mian Mākhan in charge of the fort, the Sultan returned to Delhi.

Recent expeditions had impressed upon the King the necessity of establishing the headquarters of his army at a place from which "rebels in the neighbourhood might be rendered obedient and submissive", in other words, places like Bayana, Dholpur and Gwalior could be brought under complete control. Accordingly he sent out some officers on an exploratory mission to recommend a site for a new capital. The commission after going from Delhi to Etawah ■ the Jumna recommended the place where Agra city now stands. The Sultan approved of the site and "at an auspicious hour" ordered the foundations of a fort to be laid. It was in this way that in A.D. 1505 (911 H)⁷⁷ the foundations of modern Agra were laid. Gradually a splendid city, which became the headquarters of the army and the capital of the Sultanate, grew up.⁷⁷

■ *Mākhan*, 60 (b).

■ *Ibid.*, 61 (a); Dorn, 62. Ishwari Prasad, *Medieval India*, 484, has A. D. 1504 (910 H).

⁷⁷ Tradition gives a long antiquity to Agra. It ■ said to have been a state prison in the time of Raja Kans, uncle of Lord Krishna, who ruled at Mathura. (Abdul Latif, *Agra Historical and Descriptive*, Calcutta, 1896, 2). When Mahmūd of Ghaznī invaded Hindustan he ■ ruined the place that it was reduced to ■ insignificant village. Later on it regained some of its old importance, and a Hindu prince Bādal Singh built a fort Bādalgarh there in A. D. 1475. Cunningham, *Arch. Sur. Rep.*, IV, 1871-72, 98 n., 137.

According to 'Abdulla it was formerly only a village of the district of Bayana (T.D., 42), but that is not correct, for it was a walled town when it was captured from Halbat Khan in 1492. Thus it seems to have been already well populated when Sikandar Lodi founded ■ capital there (J.I.H., VII, 131), to justify mention of an earthquake on 6 July, ■ (3 Safar, 911 H) when "buildings fell down and hills began to shake... and people thought the day of resurrection had come." T.A., I, 325-26; *Ferishta*, I, 183; T.D., 68-69; Badaoni, I, 319-20; Ranking, 1, 421 & n.; *Mākhan*, 61 (a & b).

Whatever the importance or population of Agra, it was Sikandar Lodi who rebuilt it. There he founded the Sikandari which is called after him and built a fine *bārdari* or summer-house, afterwards converted into the tomb of Maryam Zamāni, Jahāngir's mother. But the new capital took time

The first effect of the shifting of the capital from Delhi to Agra was that Dholpur ■■■ captured. The Sultan placed it in charge of Qamaruddin⁷⁹ with a garrison. Dholpur's capture so much encouraged the Sultan that making it a base of operations he started for Gwalior after the rainy season in A.D. 1505 (911 H).⁸⁰ He declared the war to be a Jihād⁸⁰ and constantly ravaged the Raja's territory in the hope of exacting his surrender. But his devastation of the countryside only made the campaign a long-drawn and nerve wrecking affair. For about a whole year from September, 1505 to May, 1506 he fought and destroyed, but Raja Mān Singh successfully defied him by his hit-and-run tactics. It appears that Sikandar was not strong enough to force the surrender of Gwalior, nor ■■■ Raja Mān strong enough to drive him out. At last the reckless destruction of the place came ■■■ boomerang to the Sultan. No crops were left standing, and because of the terror Sikandar had inspired, even the Banjārās (gipsy merchants) would not go near the royal camp,⁸¹ and scarcity of provisions compelled the Sultan to raise the siege. Mān Singh ambushed the retreating army near Jatwar⁸² lying north of Gwalior, and inflicted heavy casualties. In a word the campaign to Gwalior ended in utter failure.

A direct attack on Gwalior having failed again, the Sultan reverted to the policy of capturing the smaller fortresses in its vicinity. On February 6, 1507 (23 Ramzān, 912 H)⁸³ Sikandar Lodi arrived at Uditnagar or Avantgarh lying south of Mandlaer on the Chambal. Situated 28 miles south-west of Karauli it lies at the southern mouth of the Pannar Pass running between Narwar and

to be as good as Delhi as the coins of Sikandar Lodi struck at Agra are not so fine as those of Delhi (J.(P.)A.S.B., XI, 1915, 479). Akbar (A.N., II, 246-47) and Jahāngir (*Tuzuk*, Rogers and Beveridge, I, 4) revived its glory. When Shāhjahān retransferred his capital to Delhi, ■■■ ■■■ for doing ■■■ was Agra's overgrowth of population, narrowness of ■■■ and want of space in the fort. Arch. Sur. Rep., 1911-12, 3.

⁷⁹ T.A., I, 325; Ferishta, I, 83; M.R., I, 464; *Makhzan*, 61 (b) has Mu'isuddīn in place of Qamaruddin.

⁸⁰ T.A., I, 326; Ferishta, I, 183. ⁸¹ *Makhzan*, 61 (a); T.A., I, 326.

⁸² T.A., I, 326; Ferishta, I, 183; *Makhzan*, ■■■ (a).

⁸³ Ferishta, I, 183 last line has Janwar ■■■ Nizāmuddīn has Chatawar. So has Ni'amatulla, *Makhzan*, 61 (a). Jatwar lies north of Gwalior. Ain, Jarrett, II, 187.

⁸⁴ *Makhzan*, 62 (a).

Gwalior.⁶⁴ Naturally, according to Ferishta, the King considered Uditnagar (Utgir) as the key to the reduction of Gwalior,⁶⁵ and began the investment of the citadel at a time declared auspicious by the astrologers. Malik 'Alā'uddin succeeded in effecting a breach in the bastions, and although he was blinded in the act, he forced his entry into the citadel. After the fort ■■■ taken by assault, the Rajputs fell back on their dwellings and villas and fought bravely,⁶⁶ but unable to force the enemy to retreat, the ■■■■ performed *jauhar* and the men died fighting.

The Sultan conferred Uditnagar on Mian Bhikan, son of Mujāhid Khan, to destroy temples and raise mosques in their stead.⁶⁷ Soon after, however, Mujāhid Khan was arrested on a charge of disloyalty and the fort was transferred to Malik Tājuddin Kambūh. In the last week of May, 1507 (Muharram, 913 H) Sikandar Shāh left for Dholpur by a circuitous route probably because he feared an attack from Raja Mān. But the departure from the usual route proved unfortunate. "Men died of thirst and were crushed to death by the press of the baggage animals. A single jug of water sold at 15 Sikandarī *tanhās*. Some died of want of water; others who obtained water drank so unrestrainedly that they also collapsed. The dead were counted at 800."⁶⁸ With great difficulty the Sultan arrived at Dholpur and thence proceeded to Agra where he passed the rainy season.

Sikandar's encirclement of Gwalior was proceeding according to plan. Dholpur, Mandlaer and Avantgarh situated on the west and north-west of Gwalior had been captured. At the close of the rainy season in September, A. D. 1507 (913 H),⁶⁹ the Sultan marched against Narwar, a strong fortress with a perimeter of eight *kuroh*,

⁶⁴ Avantgarh also called Utgir and Himmatgarh ■■■ a Mahāl in Sarkar Mandlaer. *Ann.*, Jarrett, II, 190; Blochmann, I, 412 n. 1; Cunningham, *Arch. Sur. Rep.*, II, 328, 330; I.G. Atlas, pl. 34 B2, where it is shown as Utgarh; C.I.S.G., I, 243.

⁶⁵ Ferishta, I, 184, lines 6-9. ⁶⁶ *Makhzan*, 62 (a).

⁶⁷ *Makhzan*, 62 [a]; Ferishta, I, 184; T.A., I, 327.

⁶⁸ T.A., I, 328; *Makhzan*, 62 (a-b); Ferishta, I, 184.

⁶⁹ T.A., I, 328. Ferishta, I, 184 ■■■ 914 H. We learn from both Niskmud-din (T.A., I, 329) and Ferishta (I, 184, line 8 from below) that the siege of Narwar alone took ■■■ year. Again we learn from both (T.A., I, 330; Ferishta, I, 185, lines 1-2) that he returned from there in Sh'abān, 914 H. Consequently he could not have gone there in 914 H but in 913 ■■■ only.

situated 44 miles south of Gwalior.⁶⁰ He also ordered Jalāl Khan, son of Mahmūd Lodi and governor of Kalpi, to march against it. Jalāl was already investing the fort when the Sultan arrived there. Narwar was a dependency of Malwa,⁶¹ but its Tomar Raja, whose ancestors had ruled it since 1398,⁶² fluctuated in his allegiance between the Sultan of Malwa and the ruler of Gwalior. Undaunted by the combined attack of Kalpi and Agra, the ruler of Narwar offered determined resistance which was prolonged to ■■■ full year⁶³ because of the dissensions and suspicions existing between Sikandar Lodi and Jalāl Khan from the very beginning. Sikandar was envious of the strong army of Jalāl, and when in spite of it the besiegers died in large numbers, he began to suspect the loyalty of Jalāl Khan. He contrived to imprison the prince, sent him to Avantgarh, and in the end succeeded in starving Narwar into surrender, but not before the garrison had left the citadel with all their belongings.⁶⁴ The Sultan stayed at Narwar for six months during which time he destroyed temples, built mosques, and constructed a fort wall around it.⁶⁵

Leaving Narwar in charge of Rāj Singh Kachchwāhā,⁶⁶ he marched to Lahayer situated 50 miles south-east of Gwalior,⁶⁷ on 10 December, 1508 (26 Sh'abān, 914 H).⁶⁸ He stayed there for some months during which he appointed his son Jalāl Khan to the governorship of Kalpi. Sikandar Shāh left Lahayer on 1 May, 1509 (10 Muharram, 915 H), cleared its neighbourhood of "rebels and disturbers of peace", and then establishing small posts on the route 'at every place',⁶⁹ he returned to Agra.

The capture of Narwar cut off the possibility of military assistance to Raja Mān Singh from the side of Mewar. Besides, the

⁶⁰ Tieffenthaler, I, 175 gives a description of the fort. Also Ain, Jarrett, II, 190; Imp. Gaz., X, 227; Ranking, Badaoni, I, n. T.A. De, 376 n. 3. *Makhzan*, ■■ (b).

⁶¹ T.A., I, 328; Ferishta, I, 184; *Makhzan*, 62 (b).

⁶² C.I.S.G., I, 272-73. ⁶³ T.D., 87.

⁶⁴ T.A., I, 329; Ferishta, I, 184; *Makhzan*, 63 (a).

⁶⁵ T.A., I, 330; Ferishta, I, 185; T.D., 71. ⁶⁶ C.I.S.G., I, 273.

⁶⁷ Rennal's map has Lahar, correctly so, in Gwalior State. Hunter, Imp. Gaz., 400; Ranking, Badaoni, I, 423 n. 3.

⁶⁸ T.A., I, 330; Ferishta, I, 185; Badaoni, I, 321. M.R., I, 469.

⁶⁹ T.A., I, 330.

occupation of Dholpur, Mandrael, Avantgarh, Narwar, Lahayer and Hathkant had cast an iron ring of encirclement round Gwalior, and it was left in isolation to await its inevitable doom, which it at last met at the hands of Sikandar's son and successor Ibrāhīm Lodī. But the ten years (1500-1509) of continual warfare had cost the Sultanate much more than it had gained from it. In 1505 Bābur had started his campaigns in the North-Western-Frontier region of India. In his *Memoirs* Bābur notes that when he first came to Kabul in 1504-5 (910 H), the government of Behreh, Khushāb and Chenāb was held by Saiyyad 'Alī Khan on behalf of Sikandar Lodī, but alarmed by his (Bābur's) inroads, he had surrendered it to Daulat Khan Lodī, the governor of the Punjab.¹⁰⁰ It is clear from this statement that Sikandar Lodī, while fighting against the Tomars, criminally neglected the North-West-Frontier and the Punjab. In view of the fact that Sikandar's successor paid for this neglect as dearly as with his life and Empire, the gain of a few strongholds in the Tomar country was a poor compensation. Besides, Gwalior, which he had tried his best for a decade to humble, stood defiant.

Relations with Malwa

The capture of Narwar had brought Sikandar Lodī too close to Malwa, in whose politics he could not help getting interested and involved. In October, A. D. 1500 (906 H) there had ascended the throne of Malwa Sultan Nāsiruddīn, a cruel, half-imbecile monarch.¹⁰¹ How he could maintain himself on the throne for ten long years, in spite of the numerous conspiracies to remove him,

■ D.N. (B), II, 382.

¹⁰¹ The king was believed to be a regicide. Besides, he used to abandon himself to the most shameless excesses, particularly in drunkenness. One day in a state of intoxication he fell into a reservoir of water. Four female slaves, ■ the risk of their lives, pulled him out. Next day, when they related to him the incident, he thought they ■ ironical about his inebriety and cut them down with his own sword in spite of their cries for mercy. Farishta, II, 261.

His father Ghayāsuddīn (1469-1500) was no better. He maintained a harem as large as a city. Farishta, II, 261. Also, *Memoirs of Jahāngīr*, Rogers and Beveridge, I, 366-67.

is a matter of surprise. At last in A. D. 1510 (916 H) the disgusted nobles persuaded his eldest son Shihābuddīn to assume charge of the government. The prince left Mandu and collected a large force to seize the throne, but he ■■■ defeated by his father in the neighbourhood of Dhar. Thereupon Shihābuddīn appealed to Sikandar Lodī promising to surrender Chanderi ■■■ the price for his help.¹⁰² The Sultan naturally ■■■ very happy at the offer and, as the fleeing Malwa prince arrived at Shivpur,¹⁰³ he sent him ■■■ horse and a robe of honour.¹⁰⁴

But soon after the Malwa king breathed his last after nominating his third son Mahmūd ■■■ his successor. At this Shihābuddīn cancelled his proposed visit to Sikandar Lodī and turned back towards Mandu to claim the throne. Mahmūd having been accepted by the nobles headed by Muhāfiz Khan, Mandu refused admittance to Shihāb. However, Mahmūd soon after fell out with the all powerful Muhāfiz, and afraid of the latter's power he slipped out of the fort and sought the help of the veteran Rajput Medīnī Rai and Sharza Khan, son of Behjat Khan, governor of Chanderi.¹⁰⁵ On his departure Muhāfiz Khan gave the crown to prince Sāhib Khan the second son of Nāsiruddīn. Now a triangular contest for the Malwa throne ensued among the three princes, Shihāb Khan, Sāhib Khan who was supported by Muhāfiz Khan, and Mahmūd who was supported by Medīnī Rai. Mahmūd and Medīnī attacked and defeated Sāhib Khan who with Muhāfiz Khan fled to

¹⁰² T.A., I, 330; Ferishta, I, 185; II, 262.

¹⁰³ Badaoni, I, 321; Ranking, I, 434; Ferishta, I, 186. *Makhzan*, 63 (a) has Sipri. Shivpur, on the ■■■■■ boundary of the erstwhile Gwalior State, is quite close ■■■ Avantgarh. I.G. Atlas, 38, B2; Hodivla, 498.

¹⁰⁴ This happened according to Nizāmuddin, Ferishta, and Ni'amatulla in about December, 1508 (Sh'abān, 914 H), when after ■■■ reduction of Narwar, the Sultan was staying there. T.A., I, 330; Ferishta, I, 184-85; *Makhzan*, 63 (b).

At another place, in their narrative of Malwa history, Nizāmuddin and Ferishta put the rebellion of ■■■■ Khan in A. ■■■ 1510 (916 H). T.A., III, 382, Ferishta, II, 262 line 11. This ambiguity finds repetition in C.H.I., III, 244, 364. But 916 H seems to be correct. Nizāmuddin says that Shihāb died one year after the rebellion, and according to him Shihāb died in 917 H (A. D. 1511).

T.A., Da, III, 870 ff. Also Ferishta, II, 264.

¹⁰⁵ Ferishta, II, 263.

Gujarat.¹⁰⁵ Thereafter Sāhib Khan became a refugee with 'Adil Khan III, the ruler of Berar.¹⁰⁷ Meanwhile Shihābuddin also died of his exertions in A. D. 1511 (917 H).¹⁰⁸

Mahmūd's rivals were thus eliminated for the time being and he got firmly established in Mandu. His friend in need, Medinī Rai, ordered a purge of all the disaffected and intriguing elements, and a large number of nobles were executed ■ removed from service. But the ascendancy of the Rajputs under Medinī Rai was resented by the Malwa grandees headed by Behjat Khan, governor of Chanderi. Behjat appealed to Sikandar Lodi and promised to read the Sultan's Khutba at Chanderi if he helped in defeating Mahmūd and Medinī Rai and crowning Sāhib Khan in Mandu.¹⁰⁹ Muhāfiz Khan, who was with Sāhib Khan, also in the meantime personally approached Sikandar Lodi for succour,¹¹⁰ and the latter sent a force of twelve thousand cavalry under the command of 'Imādul Mulk Lodi¹¹¹ and Sa'id Khan to help Sāhib Khan upon whom he conferred the title of Sultan Muhammad, thereby obliging both Behjat Khan as well as the fugitive prince.

But Medinī Rai, who had just then defeated a force of Muzaffar Shāh Gujarati,¹¹² ■ not to be daunted by all this. He marched with 40,000 Rajputs against 'Imādul Mulk at which, according to Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, the Sultan recalled his forces.¹¹³ Very soon

¹⁰⁵ In Gujarat a quarrel ■ between Sāhib Khan and the Persian ambassador Yādgār Beg Qizilbāsh, and, although all accounts attribute the trouble to the ambassador's misconduct, both he and the prince were ordered to leave Champaner, A. D. 1513. Ferishta, II, 263.

Asfār-i-Sikandar, 140, gives the name of the ambassador as Mirzā Ibrāhīm. Commissariat, *Gujarat*, I, 286-87.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 285. ¹⁰⁸ Ferishta, II, 264.

¹⁰⁹ T.A., III, 388; Ferishta, II, 264; M.R., I, 471.

¹¹⁰ Ferishta, II, 264, line 6 from below.

¹¹¹ Ferishta, II, 264 line 8 from below. T.A., I, 332 has 'Imādul Mulk Badah, whose ■ Ahmad'.

¹¹² Ferishta, II, 64.

¹¹³ T.A., III, 391. C.I.S.G., I, 410-11. According to Ferishta Sikandar Lodi recalled ■ army because Behjat Khan delayed and made excuses about getting the Sultan's Khutba read and coins struck in his name at Chanderi, Ferishta, II, 265.

Another version is that the presence of the Sultan's army in Sāhib Khan's (Muhammad's) camp frightened Sultan Mahmūd into agreeing to assign Bhilsa, Raisen and Dhamoni to Prince Muhammad, and the reconciliation

after, however, he took advantage of the differences which had arisen between Behjat Khan and prince Muhammad¹¹⁴ and ordered Sa'id Khan son of Mubarak Khan Lodi, Shaikh Jamāl of 'Usmān Farmūli, Rai Ugra Sen Khichi,¹¹⁵ Khizr Khan and Khwājā Ahmad to help Muhammad Khan seize Chanderi from Behjat. Finding resistance useless, Behjat made his submission in A. D. 1515 (921 H).¹¹⁶ The royal generals occupied Chanderi, and although the fief remained in the name of prince Muhammad, the authority of Sikandar Lodi was firmly established there.

Chanderi had fallen into the Sultan's lap without much effort — his part because of the civil war in Malwa. Besides, each and every candidate's efforts to gain Sikandar Lodi's support at one time or the other, had made him a very important factor in the politics of that region. This brought to him many more gains. In A. D. 1509 (915 H) he had been lucky in acquiring another important, though small, principality, that of Nagor under almost equally dramatic circumstances. It had so happened that 'Alī Khan and Abu Bakr, brothers of Muhammad Khan, ruler of Nagor, had plotted against him and had fled to the court of Sikandar Lodi. Afraid lest Sikandar's support to them should bring about his ruin, Muhammad sent presents and gifts to the Sultan and made his submission by getting the Khutba read and coins struck at Nagor

rendered useless the presence of Sikandar's army in Muhammad's camp T.A., III, 392; Ferishta, II, 265.

But reconciliation or no reconciliation, Sikandar Lodi, who — trying to get the best advantage out of the struggle, would not have recalled his forces until the threat from Modinī Rai was there.

¹¹⁴ Ferishta, II, 265.

¹¹⁵ Both T.A., I, 332-33 and Ferishta, I, 185 have *راجہ سیکر سن* but Briggs has Ugra Sen and that seems to be correct. Ugra Sen Khichi is said to have been obliged by domestic quarrels to abandon Gagraun and found Khichipur (wrongly called Khiljipur). Hodivala, 472. Also I.G., XV, 279.

This Ugra Sen Khichi is most probably identical with Ugra Sen Parabha of the Gujarat Chronicles. Bayaly, 256 and 272 n.; Ferishta, II, 210.

Khichi and Kachchwāhās are often confounded by Persian writers. The Khichis are a branch of — Chauhāns and are entirely distinct from Kachchwāhās, Crooke, *Tribes and Castes*, III, 278. Khichi country or Khichiwara comprises most of the country between Guna, Sarangpur and Bhilsa in Bundelkhand. I.G., XXI, 34.

— Briggs, I, 583-84.

in Sultan Sikandar's name. Sikandar Lodi was immensely pleased with Muhammad Khan and sent him a horse and a robe of honour.¹¹⁷

After the acquisition of Chanderi, the prestige of the Sultan rose very high. Many other governors of the Malwa Kingdom tried to go over to Sikandar Lodi. It was in these circumstances that in A. D. 1516 (922 H)¹¹⁸ 'Ali Khan Nagori, governor of Shivpur persuaded Daulat Khan, governor of Ranthambhor in the Malwa dominion, to surrender the fortress to Sultan Sikandar. Daulat Khan felt inclined to espouse the friendship of a stronger ruler, and promised to surrender Ranthambhor if Sikandar Lodi came in person to take its possession. But when the Sultan went up to Bayana for the purpose, Daulat Khan evaded handing it over to the Sultan at the instance of 'Ali Khan who was playing a double game. Sikandar was greatly annoyed at the duplicity of 'Ali Khan, but he did not do anything beyond relieving him of Shivpur and giving it to his brother Abu Bakr.¹¹⁹

Leaving Bayana the King arrived at Agra via Bari, a township in the Sarkar of Agra,¹²⁰ and Dholpur. He once more thought of capturing Gwalior and, therefore, sent summons to his Amirs to report at the capital with their armies. But his plans were set at naught by his illness, a sort of quinsy.¹²¹ "The Sultan became daily more and more emaciated and weak," writes 'Abdulla, "but owing to his overriding passion for work, he took no account of his health and discharged his duties, in spite of the physical breakdown".¹²² In the last stages even a morsel of food or water would not pass his throat, and he died — the night of Saturday-Sunday 21-22 November, 1517 (8 Zilqa'da, 923 H).¹²³

¹¹⁷ T.A., I, 331; Ferishta, I, 185. *Makhzan*, 64 (b).

¹¹⁸ Ferishta, I, 185.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 186, line 5.

¹²⁰ Tieffenthaler, I, 166. Badaoni, Ranking, I, 425.

¹²¹ Ferishta as translated by Briggs, I, 585. Ranking, I, 425 n. 6 contradicts him. He says that Sikandar died from suffocation, owing to the impaction of a morsel of food in the air passage. But he does not seem to be correct in view of the fact that there was a gradual intensification of the disease, and he did not die of suffocation all of a sudden.

¹²² T.D., 99.

¹²³ T.A., I, 334; Ferishta, I, 186; T.D., — and Dorn, 65 have the year only. Badaoni alone has 17 Zilqa'da.

The length of Sikandar's reign is stated by our chroniclers to be 28 years and 5 months. T.A., I, 334; Ferishta, I, 186. But they themselves aver that

An Estimate of Sikandar Lodī

Sikandar Shāh had ruled for twenty-nine years, full of glory and distinction. He was the greatest ruler of the Lodī dynasty, and far outshone both his father Bahlūl and his son Ibrāhīm. During his reign he had retrieved the prestige of the Sultanate and extended its territories. He had removed the last vestiges of the Jaunpur kingdom and had conquered and occupied Bīhar. The Raja of Tirhut had acknowledged his suzerainty and the powerful kings of Bengal and Orissa thought it wise to befriend him. The region around Agra was brought by him under complete control and all recalcitrance in Bayana, Dholpur, Etawah, Chandwār tract had been wiped out. Chanderi had been wrested and Nagor humbled, and the region up to Ranthambhor was completely consolidated. Withal he had considerably weakened the State of Gwalior, and had helped the dismemberment of the kingdom of Malwa. We hear little of the Punjab during his reign, but Bābur's notices aver that it was more obedient to Sikandar than it had been to his predecessor.

As a king as well as a man, Sikandar Lodī has earned high praise at the hands of Muslim historians. According to them he was verging almost on the ideal.¹²⁴ He was averse to pomp and show and rebuked those who wasted money on ostentation.¹²⁵ To his sagacity were added a liberal, polite and charitable disposition. Every six months he got prepared a list of the indigent and the meritorious and allotted suitable allowances to each one of them.¹²⁶ Every winter he distributed clothes and shawls to the needy. Cooked and uncooked food was distributed at places in the city every day.¹²⁷ On certain days like the 'Īd, Bārāwafāt, the anniversary of the Prophet's death, and in the month of Ramzān, charities were distributed and amnesty granted to certain classes of prisoners. Following the example of the King, the nobles also vied with one another in giving charities.¹²⁸

he had ascended the throne on 17 Sh'abān, 894 H. He, therefore, did not rule for 28 but 29 years and three months. Also see, Hodivala, 472.

¹²⁴ T.A., I, 335; W.M., 6 (b); M.R., I, 473.

¹²⁵ T.A., I, 337; T.S.A., 60-62; M.R., I, 476.

¹²⁶ *Makhsan*, 66 (b), 68 (a); Dorn, I, 66.

¹²⁷ W.M., 7 (a & b).

¹²⁸ *Makhsan*, 67 (b), 68 (a).

Sikandar Lodī revered learning and always kept the company of accomplished and learned men.¹²⁰ It is said that the Sultan bestowed lands and gifts upon the learned and the religious to an extent that had never been known in former reigns. Sikandar Shāh himself was a scholar of Persian literature and a poet of no mean merit. His poetical pseudonym was Gulrukhi, and he recited poetry beautifully.¹²¹

Sikandar's association with the learned had added to his piety and religious-mindedness. He said his prayers regularly, and after the afternoon prayer went into an assembly of the Mullahs.¹²² Thereafter he read the Holy Quran. He took personal interest in deciding suits, helping the needy and making his subjects happy. It was his habit to keep awake till late in the night to look into the petitions of the needy and the aggrieved and to dictate *farmāns* to governors of provinces. He was truly brave.¹²³ The way Sikandar Shāh treated his fallen brother Bārbak Shāh must have endeared him to all. He chid the Darwesh who had prophesied victory against his brother¹²⁴ and scolded Mubārak Khan Nūhānī for suggesting reprisals against Husain Shāh Sharqī.¹²⁵

The lavish praise of the chroniclers indicates that the Sultan's few deficiencies and hypocritical ways were surely overlooked. Sikandar Shāh drank wine secretly in order "to keep himself in health".¹²⁶ His piety had also to be compromised with his love of music. He had many accomplished musicians in his palace.¹²⁷ *Shahnāī* was his favourite instrument, and was played in his presence whenever he so desired. It is said that when he was dying, he paid expiation money for drinking wine, shaving his beard and for occasional neglect of *Rozā* and *Namāz*.¹²⁸

¹²⁰ T.S.A., 46.

■ Badaoni has quoted some verses of the poet-king Gulrukhi which betray a delicacy ■ feeling and expression.

"Into the eye of the needle of her eye lashes,

I shall pass the thread of my soul.

If Gulrukhi could describe the charms of her teeth,

He would say they were water-white pearls of the ocean of her speech."

Badaoni, I, 323; Ranking, I, 426.

¹²¹ *Makhzan*, 66 (a).

¹²² T.D., 32; T.S.A., 31-34.

¹²³ *Makhzan*, 99 (b). T.S.A., 97; T.D., 82.

¹²⁴ W.M., 20 (a).

¹²⁵ T.D., 37; E and D, IV, 446.

¹²⁶ T.S.A., 48; T.D., 41.

¹²⁷ T.D., 99; W.M., 26 (b).

The Sultan took a keen interest in the welfare of the Musalmans. He founded Masjids throughout his dominions, and appointed a preacher, a reader, and a sweeper to each.¹³⁸ Thus he turned Masjids almost into government institutions. A contemporary marble slab, now placed in the Delhi Museum of Archaeology, declares him a staunch Muslim who made foundations of Islam strong.¹³⁹ He did not permit any un-Islamic practices go on unchecked. Women were forbidden to perform pilgrimages to tombs.¹⁴⁰ The Sultan forbade the annual procession of the "Standard of Sālār Mas'ūd" from Delhi and other places to Bahraich.¹⁴¹ He also stopped the display of *Tasiās* during the month of Muharram as also the worship of Sitala, the small-pox divinity.¹⁴²

Sikandar's sense of justice had earned him the praise of everyone, high and low.¹⁴³ "So great was Sultan Sikandar's justice", says 'Abdulla, "that no man could even look sternly at another." His Wakil Dariyā Khan Nūhānī was directed to remain all day, until the first watch of the night, on the seat of justice; the Qāzī with twelve of the 'Ulama were always present within the King's own palace. They tried all cases brought before the court of law and delivered judgements of the nature of which the Sultan received immediate information. Certain young slaves were specially appointed to work from morning until the close of the sittings to report to the King immediately everything occurring in the law-courts.¹⁴⁴ The procedure of giving justice was short and swift. When a civil suit from a Saiyyad against Miān Malik, the jagirdar of pargana Arwal in Gaya district¹⁴⁵ took about two months, and no decision

¹³⁸ T.A., I, 336; *Makhsan*, 67 (a).

¹³⁹ *Lat.*, III, 189.

¹⁴⁰ T.D., 40.

¹⁴¹ Sālār Mas'ūd Ghāsi was a celebrated general of Mahmūd Ghaznavi, who, after numberless encounters with the Hindus, fell at their hands in a battle near Bahraich in A. D. 1033 (424 H). T.A., I, 336 and note in De's *tr.*, 386; T.D., 40; Dorn, I, 66.

Reverence for this "martyr and Ghāsi" was natural, but in the procession to Bahraich the Sultan saw a tinge of idolatry and banned it.

¹⁴² W.M., 7 (b).

¹⁴³ For an instance of his sense of justice see T.S.A., 35-36.

¹⁴⁴ E & D, IV, 454. Also *Ferishta*, I, 186.

¹⁴⁵ The words in the text are "from the district of Ardal which is twenty or thirty *kos* from Panna on the Agra side." Prof. Hodivala rightly points out that both Ardal and Panna are wrong. It is Arwal in Gaya district

arrived at, the Sultan got exasperated at the delay. He ordered Miān Bhua, who was inquiring into the case, not to allow any one to leave the court that day until the ■■■ was decided. The judges and the Vazīr's Divān pondered over the case "until the third watch of the night" when judgement was delivered against Miān Malik. He was made to confess his guilt and was deprived of his estate.¹⁴⁶ Even while the King was riding or hunting and some one brought a complaint, his grievance was immediately looked into. The king was stern but not vindictive. When a person had once been convicted of a crime, he never again gave him anything, but at the same time he did not cease to treat him with kindness.¹⁴⁷ He even ordered periodical releases from jail of persons not guilty of violent criminal offences.¹⁴⁸

Sikandar Lodī tackled the problems of civil administration with tact and ability. According to 'Abdulla during his reign countless Amīrs belonging to the Afghan tribe had gathered round him. This immigration of Afghans was in pursuance of the invitation extended by his father and continued after him. Bahlūl's state policy as well as his attitude towards his tribesmen had given them power at the cost of the crown. Sikandar would have nothing of the kind. He, therefore, dealt with the problem of the Afghan nobility in two ways. Firstly, he tried to raise their standard of culture and education. He spared no pains to educate the Afghan chiefs and clansmen, and according to Nizāmuddin education spread among the Amīrs, sons of Amīrs and soldiers.¹⁴⁹ According to 'Abdulla, the Sultan insisted on people being modest, honest and polite in manners. The nobles abandoned their feuds and duels and "the road of disorder and unrest was closed". They chose to remain content with their assignments and passed their lives in the greatest security and happiness.¹⁵⁰

Secondly, he kept a close eye on his officers. Like 'Alāuddin Khafjī, Sikandar Lodī used to receive reports regularly of happenings

lying on river Sonē about 44 miles S.W. of Patna city. Hodivala, 470.

Also W.M., 13 (a); Seely, *Road Book of India*, 15-16; Constable, 28 D.C.

■ W.M., 13 (a-b). ¹⁴⁷ E and D, IV, 449.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 448. ¹⁴⁹ T.A., I, 336.

¹⁵⁰ The translation of the passage in E and D, IV, 451 does not convey the correct sense. I am in agreement with ■ B. Roy's translation, *op. cit.*, 116.

in his Empire.¹⁵¹ If anything unpleasant or untoward happened, it was immediately set right. This was possible because of the revival of *Dāk Chaukīs* or system of transmitting news by relays of horses. Besides, ■ efficient and so stern was his espionage system that sometimes he received information about men who had been presumably all alone, and the gullible credited him with supernatural powers.¹⁵² He sent two *farmāns* everyday to civil officers in the various parts of his Empire and army commanders ■ campaigns. Whenever a *farmān* was sent to a district officer, he received it with the greatest respect,¹⁵³ and orders not marked secret were read out from the pulpit of the mosques for general information. Similarly, the Sultan was very strict about the audit of accounts and honesty of officers. Any loss of government property had to be made good by the officer in charge from his own pocket.¹⁵⁴ He would not spare even high officials like Mubārak Khan Mūjikhail, governor of Jaunpur, and Malik Asghar, governor of Delhi, when their accounts came under inspection. Education of the Amīrs and army officers on the one hand and strictness in administration on the other made the Afghan nobles completely obedient so that the Sultan could boast: "If I order one of my slaves to be seated in a palanquin, the entire body of nobility would carry him on their shoulders at my bidding".¹⁵⁵

But otherwise he was non-interfering. If he granted an assignment to any one, he never removed him until ■ fault was proved against him.¹⁵⁶ If any one found any hidden treasure, he was permitted to retain it.¹⁵⁷ There ■ a keen desire on the part of the Sultan to keep the services satisfied and he did his utmost to

¹⁵¹ T.A., I, 338; Ferishta, I, 187.

¹⁵² Anecdotes of how he got information and ■ve justice are related in T.A., I, 336-38; Dorn, I, 68-69; Ferishta, I, 187-88; and T.S.A., 42-43.

■ T.A., I, 337-38; T.D., 40; E and D, IV, 486.

¹⁵³ W.M., 13 (b).

¹⁵⁴ Passage in T.D. ■ translated by N. B. Roy, *op. cit.*, 134.

¹⁵⁵ E and D, IV, 449.

¹⁵⁶ Rizqulla Mushtaql and Ahmad Yādgār give two anecdotes in this connection. Ahmad Yādgār, however, concludes with ■ unusually bold remark. Comparing Sikandar Lodī's times with his own he says: "God be praised, for endowing the Sultan (Sikandar) with such a generous spirit. In these days (i.e. Mughal Emperor Jahāngīr's) if any one were to find even a few copper *tanhās*, our rulers would immediately pull down his house to examine every nook and corner for more." W.M., 21 (a) T.S.A., 36.

gain the goodwill and affection of his officers and soldiers. No administration is, however, without its faults. In making selection to posts Sikandar Shāh looked ■■■ to heredity than to merit. Moreover he favoured the Afghans, especially those of his own tribe.¹⁴⁸

In view of the fact that Sikandar Lodī ■■■ engaged all his life in waging war against hostile neighbours and recalcitrant governors, his achievements in the field of administration ■■■ very creditable indeed. Though an autocratic monarch, still he reposed great trust in his officers and ministers. Much of the credit for the efficiency of Sikandar Shāh's administration also goes to his Vazīr Miān Bhuṭ. Only one instance of Bhuṭ's sagacity would suffice to show the merit of the man and the confidence the King reposed in him. When once asked by the King how corruption among his officers could be eradicated, the veteran noble told him that firstly he should have faith in his officers and secondly he should pay them well, so that they might be free from avarice.¹⁴⁹

In a word under Sikandar Lodī's efficient administration the Afghan chiefs were kept under control. The Hindu zamindars were kept down with a strong hand. The corn duties were abolished, agriculture was encouraged and trade was carried on in perfect security. Consequently, prices of food grains fell. The people were happy and the glory of the Sultanate was revived.¹⁵⁰

Why Is Sikandar Lodī Known as a Bigot?

Although a just monarch, Sikandar Lodī could not rise above his religious prejudices. Indeed he revived some of those instruments of tyranny which had lain dormant for many years past. After Timūr's departure the Sultanate had got busy in recapturing and consolidating its lost ground. Here and there a Hindu might have been harshly treated or a temple broken, but by and large the fifteenth century Sultans of Delhi had not indulged in any senseless persecution. During this period the Sultanate was not so powerful as to be able to oppress the Hindus. It could not also antagonise the Hindu population in the interest of its own survival.

¹⁴⁸ *Makhzan*, 66 (b); E and D, IV, 451.

¹⁴⁹ T.A., I, 340-41. ¹⁵⁰ T.D., 115, 112; T.S.A., 48-49

Sikandar Lodi had succeeded in re-establishing the authority of the Sultanate on quite a firm basis. He was thus in a position to deal with the Hindus in a stern manner, and he did so. Even as a youth he had expressed a desire to put an end to the Hindu bathing festival at Kurukshetra (Thanesar).¹⁴¹ Such a prince could not have made a tolerant king, and many incidents are related pointing to his uncompromising attitude. But they are mere incidents and they do not point to a definite and persistent policy of persecution. An instance is the oft-quoted case of Bodhan ■ Naudhan Brahman. Bodhan lived at Kaner, near Lakhnor in Sambhal. He had declared that "Islam was true, but his own religion was also true."¹⁴² Considering his views the Brahman seems to have been a disciple of Kabir or Ramānand.¹⁴³ When the assertion of Bodhan became public there were protests from the 'Ulama. The Sultan summoned Qazi Piyārā and Shaikh Badr from Lakhnor and many other doctors from "all directions" to deliberate on Bodhan's claim. The discussions must have been exceedingly interesting, but the details are not known to us. All the learned men, however, gave the stereotyped verdict that the Brahman should either embrace Islam or die. Bodhan chose death.¹⁴⁴

This happened, according to all annalists, after A. D. 1500, that is, after about twenty years of Sikandar's accession. Up to that time no incident of this kind has been mentioned. Even in this case Sikandar had acted judiciously; he had condemned Bodhan only after a long trial. But ■ other acts of his, which are boastfully mentioned by Persian chroniclers, do defy justification. These are not given chronologically and we have no context of circumstances to find an explanation for them. It is said that in Mathura "and other places" he turned temples into mosques, and established Muslim Sarais, colleges and bazārs in the Hindu places of worship.¹⁴⁵ The author of the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī* adds that idols

¹⁴¹ W.M., 7 (b) and 8 (a).

¹⁴² *Makhsan*, 65 (b); Dorn, I, 65; Ferishta, I, 181.

¹⁴³ *Asiatic Researches*, XVI, 55. Also H. H. Wilson, *Religious Sects of the Hindus*, Ed. Rost, I, 53-56; Sir George Grierson in J.R.A.S., 1909, 642 n.

¹⁴⁴ T.A., I, 323; Ferishta, I, 181; Dorn, 65-66.

¹⁴⁵ *Makhsan*, 67 (a); T.A., I, 335-36; Dorn, 66; Ferishta, I, 186; T.D., 39.

were given to butchers who used them as meat-weights.¹⁶⁶ Mathura, one of the most venerable cities of the Hindus, associated with the life of Lord Krishna, had the strange fate of being situated between the two capitals of the Sultanate—Agra and Delhi. Time and again it suffered from the ravages of the iconoclasts right up to the time of Aurangzeb. That Sikandar's bigotry found expression there is not surprising. But what were the "other places"? Details given hint at Allahabad and Varanasi. It is mentioned that barbers were forbidden from shaving the Hindus at Mathura.¹⁶⁷ Even bathing at these holy places ■■■ discouraged. Today the Sultan's ordinances excite laughter rather than anger. To what extent they could have been enforced is difficult to say, but it is difficult to believe that all the Hindus of Mathura, Allahabad and Varanasi would have permitted themselves to look like chimpanzees because of the Sultan's orders. Similarly the assertion that Sultan Sikandar "levelled to the ground all the places of worship of the Kafirs and left neither their name nor any vestige of them"¹⁶⁸ is also highly exaggerated. Some other incidents of his bigotry relate to his releasing from jail and giving an important assignment to a Hindu prisoner who agreed to embrace Islam,¹⁶⁹ and punishing Ahmad Khan Lodi for showing consideration to the Hindus.¹⁷⁰

Indeed the few facts mentioned by the chroniclers about Sikandar's fanaticism are of the common type witnessed here and there throughout the Muslim rule in India. Besides, his acts of persecution were confined to those very regions of eastern and western Uttar Pradesh which had opposed the Sultanate relentlessly and for long, and the Sultan had retaliated with laying waste tracts from Kara to Dalman, and the country around Kol and Dholpur. In other words his religious persecution was associated with political subjugation. Thus there does not seem to be anything extraordinary in the acts and policies of Sikandar Lodi. But,

■ T.D., 39; Ahmad Yidgar and Risqulla say the same thing about the idols of Nagarkot; T.S.A., 47; W.M., 31 (b).

¹⁶⁶ Dorn, 166; W.M. 7 (a); T.D. 96-99; T.S.A., 61-63.

Sikandar himself shaved, against the tenets of Islam, and even treated rudely Hajj 'Abdul Wahab who disapproved of the practice. But he seems to have been reluctant to have extended the comfort of a shave to the Hindus.

■ T.A., I, 335.

¹⁶⁸ W.M. 13 (b), 14 (a).

¹⁶⁹ T.A., I, 331, Ferishta, I, 185.

then, why does Nizāmuddīn Ahmad followed by most other chroniclers declare that "his (Sikandar's) bigotry in Islam was so great that in this regard he went beyond the bounds even of excess".¹⁷¹

The reason for this statement is not far to seek. It has been pointed out earlier that a silver lining in the dark invasion of Timūr was that it had helped to bring Hindus and Muslims nearer to each other. The process of unity not only continued but was augmented with the passage of time. In the political sphere Hindus and Muslims were collaborating fully. Raja Trilok Chand of Baksar (near Unnao) and Raja Pratap of Bhongaon sided with the Lodī kings while their Sharqī adversary was supported by Rajas of Baghelkhand and Gwalior. In the social sphere in Sikandar's days not only had the Hindus started learning Persian, but there were Hindus like Raja Mān Singh who held extremely cosmopolitan views. Writing about him Ni'amatulla says: "Though Raja Mān professed himself to be a Hindu, he had inwardly accepted the nobility of the Islamic creed and owing to the sincerity of his belief in Islam, no Muslim ruler could gain an ascendancy over him".¹⁷² Similarly there were Muslims of the type of Ahmad Khan, son of Mubārak Khan Lodī, governor of Lakhnōr near Sambhal,¹⁷³ who was associating

¹⁷¹ T.A., I, 335. و تمسب اسلام بمرتبه دانتی که درین باب پیرست افراط رسانیده بود.

¹⁷² *Mahāsān*, 78 (b). Also N.B. Roy's Tra., 159-60.

— Most of the MSS. and the text of T.A. have Lakhnauti while one MS. has لکهنو (T.A., De, 379, n. 2). Ferishta I, 185, also has Lakhnauti. Ni'amatulla, *Mahāsān*, 64 (a), has Lucknow. I think that Lakhnauti is out of the question since Bengal was not a part of the Sultanate. Lucknow too is doubtful. We, however, know that Lakhnōr (which a MS. of T.A. has, if the *Wau* may be a mistake for *Rā*) is situated — Sambhal. Sambhal was held by Daryā Khan Lodī when Bahādī Lodī ascended the throne (T.A., I, 298) and after his death — conferred on his son, Mubārak Khan Lodī. In the list of the barons of Sultan Sikandar, Ahmad Khan and Sa'id Khan are mentioned as sons of Mubārak Khan Lodī (T.A., I, 314). In all probability Ahmad Khan succeeded Mubārak Khan Lodī to his fief, and when Sambhal was bestowed upon Āzam Humayūn, Ahmad Khan became a sort of deputy governor at Lakhnōr. Sultan Sikandar — staying at Lakhnōr when Bodhan Brahman was sent for trial by Āzam Humayūn from Sambhal, T.A., I, 323; Ferishta, I, 182-83; T.D., 67-68.

Therefore, the place of Ahmad Khan was Lakhnōr, now Shāhābād in Rampur. Lakhnōr, Lakhnau and Lakhnauti are frequently confused in Persian chronicles. (see Mrs. Beveridge's note in B.N. (B), II, Appendix T). Also — note by Prof. Hodivala, 471-72.

with the Hindus to such an extent that it was believed that he had "turned from the religion of Islam" and "had adopted the practices of unbelief."¹⁷⁴ Even the attitude of the 'Ulama was strikingly refreshing as is clear from the case of Miān 'Abdulla of Ajodhan.¹⁷⁵ Indeed Indian society was undergoing a change. This change was also due to the teachings of the fifteenth century socio-religious reformers like Kabīr and Nānak, about whom we shall study in detail in the last chapter. In such an atmosphere the few acts of intolerance on the part of Sikandar Lodi appeared to be so much out of tune with the spirit of the age that they shocked even the Persian chroniclers. In the fourteenth century, Sikandar Lodi's attitude would have caused no surprise. He would have been considered one among the common run of monarchs. But in the fifteenth century his bigotry was particularly noticeable. Hence the assertion of the chroniclers.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁴ T.A., I, 331; *Mahsan*, 64 (a).

¹⁷⁵ W.M., 7 (b), 8 (a).

¹⁷⁶ Even Rizqulla Mushtāqī, who is all praise for the achievements of Sikandar Lodi's reign, does not fail to make mention of the domination of the Muslims and the subordination of the Hindus.

بهر خانه نشاط و شادمانی نه کسی دیدی خیال قتل در خواب ندانستی کسی از جنس مثل نام هم از سنگ و م از گوهر چون گوهری	عجب عهدی همه در کامرانی نه کسی دانی کند کینه در تاب مسلمان چو دست و مدوان رام شی در دانش زبان شکوهی
--	--

(W.M., 40 (a)).

"What an age of wonder: there is merriment and festivity in every house.
 Gone are the highwaymen and ■■■ twisters of noose round the neck,
 None can think of rebellion ■■■ in dream,
 The Muslims are domineering and the Hindus subordinate,
 Forgotten is the dread of Mughal inroad.
 Divine is the Sultan's omniscience,
 Grandeur of a mountain, yielding pearl and ruby."

Also cf. the epithets in the bilingual inscription (Sanskrit and Persian) which is said to have been discovered at the village of Mubarakpur Kotla in Delhi and is dated 14 March, 1517 (20 Safar, 923 H).

و دولت شاه کفار شکن اسلام	بنا این عمارت بهاء در عهد
سکندر شاه بن بهلول شاه	بناه المجاهد فی سبیل الله

"Foundation of the construction of this well (was laid) during the reign of the king, (who is) the conqueror of infidels, the Shelter of Islam. Warrior in the path of God, Sikandar Shāh, son of Bahāldī Shāh."

Epi. Ind., Arabic and Persian Supplement, 1959-60, 8.

Chapter 10

SULTANATE UNDER IBRĀHĪM LODĪ

IT MAY BE recalled that shortly before his death Sikandar Lodī had summoned his nobles to the capital to finalise plans for the conquest of Gwalior.¹ In the meantime he breathed his last. Thus most of the nobles of the Sultanate — well as his — like Ibrāhīm Khan, Jalāl Khan, Ism'āil Khan, Mahmūd Khan and Āzam Humayūn were present in the capital when the Sultan died. Ibrāhīm and Jalāl were the eldest and most capable sons of Sikandar Shāh. They were the offspring of the same mother and Ibrāhīm was the elder of the two. Moreover Ibrāhīm's personality, intelligence, penetration, courage and "praiseworthy moral qualities", for which he was well known, too, had marked him out for kingship.²

Consequently, Ibrāhīm was elected to the throne unanimously, but the nobles vitiated their choice by having two monarchs instead of one.³ Ibrāhīm was to occupy the throne of Delhi and rule up to the boundary of the kingdom of Jaunpur, while his brother Jalāl Khan, who was already governor of Kalpi, was to rule from Kalpi to Jaunpur, that is, in the eastern and southern part of the Sultanate with his capital at Jaunpur.⁴

This division of sovereignty was not without a precedent. The freedom loving but intriguing Afghan nobles had — along asserted their right to choose their sovereign. They had influenced Bahlūl's nomination of his successor, compelling him to change his decision at the eleventh hour.⁵ After Bahlūl's death they had once again discussed the question of accession threadbare, and while the throne was given to Nizām Khan (Sikandar Lodī), his brother Bārbak Shāh was recognised as the ruler of Jaunpur. Thus the "election" of the sovereign and the division of the empire — phenomena which had been witnessed in the last regime itself and there was nothing new about it. The point to be noted in the present case,

¹ Ferishta, I, 186.

² T.A., I, 341; T.S.A., 66; Ferishta, I, 186-188.

³ *Mahhar*, 72 (2).

⁴ T.A., 341; T.D., 104; T.S.A., 66; Ferishta, I, 181.

⁵ See Chapter 9 and Ferishta, I, 178.

however, is that while Bārbak Shāh was already ruling in Jaunpur when Sikandar Shāh ascended the throne, and it was thought correct not to relieve him of his dominion, here the kingdom was divided between the two brothers and both were to ascend two thrones at the same time. Again, while the accession of Sikandar had been objected to on the ground of his alleged or real impurity of blood, no such stigma attached to the name of Ibrāhīm.

Why then did the nobles of the State divide the Sultanate of Delhi? Most of the chroniclers are silent about their motives. Badaoni and Ahmad Yādgār¹ furnish no information on the point, while the explanation of Ferishta is far from convincing. According to Ferishta, Sultan Ibrāhīm Lodi had given great umbrage to the Afghan nobles by renouncing the customs and traditions of his father and grandfather and by declaring *soon after his accession*, that sovereignty knew ■ kinship, that there was to be no distinction among officers whether of his own tribe or otherwise, and that all were to be treated as servants of the State ■ "the kings have no relations". He also adds that the Afghan chiefs who hitherto used to sit in the court, were now constrained to stand in the Sultan's presence with folded hands. This attitude of the Sultan disgusted the nobles. They conspired together and leaving Ibrāhīm in possession of Agra and a few dependent districts, raised Jalāl Khan to the throne of Jaunpur.² Thus Ferishta would like us to believe that Ibrāhīm was given a trial as Sultan of the whole of the Empire but when he failed to come up to the expectations of the nobles, they truncated his kingdom. The fact is not so. The division of the Sultanate was not an after-thought. Both the brothers were declared Sultans simultaneously. If Ferishta wants to suggest that the nobles had an inkling of the Sultan's strictness, rash temper and indecorous behaviour, he only contradicts himself for he attributes Ibrāhīm's election to the throne to his qualities of bravery, generosity and fair-mindedness.³ Moreover, if the barons had had the slightest suspicion that Ibrāhīm would not treat them well they would have found ways and means of setting aside his candidature altogether.

¹ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 430; T.S.A., 66.

² Ferishta, I, 188; Briggs, I, 590-91.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 188 line 9. Also T.A., I, 342 and Dorn, I, 70.

The motives of the nobles in taking this major decision of division of sovereignty are hinted at by Nizāmuddīn and Niʿamatulla. One has to read between the lines of their circumlocutory statements to understand the motives of the Afghan nobility. "Soldiers, and especially men of war and action", says Nizāmuddīn, "have for the sake of proper arrangement of their affairs and the reputation and grandeur of their service and command, and the greatness of their retainers and equipages, always directed all their plans and endeavours to this, that the rule of the government in the kingdom, and the passing of the orders from a well established throne should not have great power and complete predominance, for this reason they decided that Sultan Ibrāhīm should sit on the throne of Delhi and that Shāhzādā Jalāl Khan should sit on the Masnad of Sultanate of Jaunpur."⁹ Similar is the language of Niʿamatulla.¹⁰ Thus it was the selfishness and love of power of the barons that prompted them not to leave all regal authority in one hand.¹¹ The nobles had been dealt with rather sternly by Sikandar Lodī, so they thought it prudent not to leave all power in the hands of Ibrāhīm from the very beginning. The Afghan nobles were not a homogeneous lot. They were a conglomeration of races and tribes. There were the Lodīs, the Nūhānīs, the Farmūlīs, the Sarwānīs, the Yūsufkhānīs, etc. Their interests oftentimes ran parallel. The Lodīs considered themselves ■ belonging to the ruling class and the rest ■ "servants of the Lodīs".¹² It was, therefore, difficult for the nobility of the State to work in co-operation not to speak of having unanimity of opinion. Division of sovereignty would certainly reduce the power of the Delhi Sultan, and provide the nobles full scope for enhancing their power individually and collectively. It was for this that the kingdom was divided.

Ibrāhīm Lodī accepted the arrangement without protest. To begin with he probably did not suspect any evil motives ■ the part of the nobles. Even if he did, he was helpless. He could be the Sultan only with their consent. Too much assertion of authority and too much greed for having the whole might have cost him even his half of the kingdom. Moreover, Jalāl Khan ■ after all his own younger brother. He could rule in Agra and Delhi and his

⁹ T.A., I, 341; Trs. by Do., 393.

¹⁰ *Makhzan*, 72 (a).

¹¹ M.R., I, 478.

■ W.M., 63 (b).

brother at Jaunpur just as his father and uncle Bārbak Shāh had done before.

Civil War

All being well Ibrāhīm was crowned at Agra on 22 November, 1517 (8 Zilqa'da, 923 H), the very next day of Sikandar's death.¹³ "So splendid a coronation had never been witnessed before, and the people long remembered it."¹⁴ At the same time prince Jalāl Khan with the nobles and officers appertaining to his kingdom started off towards Kalpi *en route* to Jaunpur.

After about four weeks Khan-i-Jahān Nūhānī, governor of Rapri, who had learnt with disapproval¹⁵ about the division of sovereignty, came to Agra.¹⁶ His mission ostensibly was to congratulate the new Sultan, but in fact it was to address the ministers (*vazīrs*) and nobles on the folly of their decision to divide the Empire. On arrival he reproached them, declaring that sovereignty could not flourish in partnership just as two swords could not fit in one scabbard.¹⁷ His arguments impressed the nobles, more so because the partisans of Jalāl Khan had already gone away with him and there was nobody in the capital to speak in his support. How sincere Khan-i-Jahān was in his intentions, it is difficult to say, but his appeal contained seeds of a civil war. The Sultan, the nobles and officers of Delhi now put their heads together to find a way

¹³ *Makhzan*, 72 (a); T.S.A., 64; T.A., I, 341 gives no date.

¹⁴ T.S.A., 66. ¹⁵ *Makhzan*, 72 (b).

¹⁶ His name is variously given as Khan-i-Khanān Farmūlī by Ahmad Yādgar (T.S.A., 66-67 and n.), Khan-i-Jahān Lodi by Nī'amatullā (*Makhzan*, 72 (b)), and Khan-i-Jahān Nūhānī by Nisāmuddin (T.A., I, 342) and Ferishta (I, 188).

According to Ahmad Yādgar, Khan-i-Khanān (Jahān) arrived four months after the accession of Ibrāhīm, but four weeks seems more probable. According to his version only Jalāl Khan had not even reached Jaunpur when Khan-i-Khanān arrived in Agra (T.S.A., 67).

Khan-i-Jahān had come to congratulate the new Sultan. He had obviously started on the first news of the death of Sikandar and the accession of his son. Moreover, a little later, we find Sultan Ibrāhīm marching against Jalāl Khan only a month and a half after his accession, when the two brothers had broken out in open hostility. This fact rules out four months.

¹⁷ T.A., I, 342; T.D., 106; M.R., I, 479; *Makhzan*, 72 (b).

to nullify the ill-advised partition. They thought that Prince Jalāl was still at Kalpi; he had not yet fully established himself in Jaunpur, and a reconsideration of the question was still possible. Consequently it was decided to invite Jalāl Khan to Agra to discuss the issue of partition once again. The nobles, however, do not seem to have been sincere or quite decided in their minds as yet. According to Ni'amatulla what they really wanted was to open up the whole issue of sovereignty once again on the arrival of Jalāl, and were determined to keep up the discussion for their own sake, "as they never considered it convenient that public affairs should be under the restraint of one absolute monarch."¹⁸

Sultan Ibrāhīm was gradually acquiring a correct appreciation of the situation. Sovereignty had been divided not because two sons of the same mother had equal rights and should have ruled jointly, but because such an arrangement was to give the nobles a chance to play the one against the other. The nobles had assumed too much power. They had put the crown into commission. The cunning and selfishness of the old, strong and veteran noblemen of Sikandar was now unfolding itself before his eyes. The king must not be made a tool in their hands, he thought. He decided to crush them. Ibrāhīm's mind was made up. In days to come Ibrāhīm Lodī waged a relentless war against the senior nobility. In court and in camp he showed them their place. He fought them at the cost of his life and his Empire. But he did fight them.

Having fully grasped the situation, and apprehending the intrigues of the nobles, Sultan Ibrāhīm decided to cast the agreement of partition to the winds¹⁹ and bring his brother to obedience. He planned his course of action with great wisdom. Firstly, he sent to Jalāl Khan a *farmān*, couched in gracious and kind language, asking him to come immediately to the court to discuss certain urgent matters. Haibat Khan,²⁰ who was reputed to possess cunning with a persuasive tongue,²¹ was entrusted with the delivery of the message and was commissioned to fetch Prince Jalāl unattended

¹⁸ Dorn, I, 70-71; *Makhan*, 72 (a). ¹⁹ T.S.A., 67.

²⁰ Ferištā, I, 188. Haibat Khan is reported to have won the title of *Gur-gandāz* (wolf-slayer) by once slaying two wolves with one arrow. T.S.A., 209-110.

²¹ T.S.A., 67.

and with all speed.²² Secondly, he addressed *farmāns* to the nobles and officers of the eastern districts to refrain from paying allegiance to Jalāl Khan or attending his court. To each of these important chiefs like Dariyā Khan Nūhānī, governor of Bihar, Nāsir Khan, governor of Ghazipur and Shaikhzādā Muhammad Farmāli, governor of Avadh and Lucknow, who had thirty to forty thousand retainers each, Sultan Ibrāhīm sent a horse, a special *Khil'at*, a jewelled waist-dagger and other presents and asked them not to recognise the authority of Jalāl. These noblemen who loved unbridled freedom could not have wished for better. They not only turned from their allegiance to the ruler of Jaunpur but even became hostile to him.²³ Thirdly, and lastly, Ibrāhīm Lodi sent to jail his brothers like princes Isma'il Khan, Husain Khan and Mahmūd Khan so that they might not try to fish in the troubled waters.²⁴

Jalāl Khan was taken aback at the turn of events, but he acted with the greatest caution and diplomacy. He received Haibat Khan Gurgandāz well, returned artifice for artifice and cajolery for cajolery, but refused to move from Kalpi. Haibat Khan reported his failure to the Sultan, who still favouring persuasion to coercion, sent some other nobles like Shaikhzādā Sultan Muhammad, Malik Ism'ail and Qazi Hamīduddīn Hājib (the Chamberlain)²⁵ to make another attempt to induce the prince to come to Agra. They too failed in their mission.

Jalāl Khan now knew no peace. The enmity of the Amīrs of the eastern districts inspired by the order of Sultan Ibrāhīm to seize Jalāl and send him to the court,²⁶ had made the prince's position precarious. There was no alternative left for him but to publicly declare his hostility to Sultan Ibrāhīm. He held a coronation *Darbār* with great pomp and eclat,²⁷ and received anew promise of support from his partisans whom he lavishly rewarded. He assumed the title of Sultan Jalāluddīn, appointed Fatḥ Khan, son of Āzam Humayūn Sārwanī, as his Prime Minister, and got the

²² *Ibid.*, 67; T.A., I, 342.

²³ T.A., I, 342-43; T.S.A., 68; *Ferishta*, I, 188; T.D., 107; *Makhzan* 74 (a).

²⁴ T.A., I, 344; *Ferishta*, I, 189; *Makhzan*, 76 (a) has Shalkh Daulat in place of Mahmūd Khan.

²⁵ T.A., I, 342; *Ferishta*, I, 188; *Makhzan*, 73 (a-b).

²⁶ Badaoni, I, 326; Ranking, I, 430. ²⁷ T.S.A., 68-69.

Khutba read and coins struck in his own name.²⁸ He reorganised his army, improved its accoutrements and also succeeded in gaining the support of the Rājās and Zamindars of the surrounding parganas.²⁹

Finding persuasion of no avail, Ibrāhīm now determined on action. "To cast new rings of obedience" and to impress on his countrymen that he was the sole monarch of the Empire, Ibrāhīm held a second coronation ceremony on 30 December, 1517 (15 Zilhijja, 923 H).³⁰ A gorgeous throne encrusted with fine gems was placed in the Diwān Khānā and a grand Darbār was held. The Sultan conferred on all civil and military officers titles, distinctions, robes of honour, offices and jagirs according to the status of each. To attach them more and more to his side he bound them by favours and kindnesses. To please the soldiers and the common people he opened the door of munificence to the needy and the poor. By his liberal acts and dignified bearing he conferred new glory on kingship and sovereignty. In Ibrāhīm's court one was reminded of the awe-inspiring grandeur of the courts of Balban and 'Alāuddīn Khaljī.³¹ Ibrāhīm introduced the custom that when the Sultan was in the Darbār, no one howsoever great should be seated in the court.³²

Having proclaimed himself the sole monarch of the Sultanate, Ibrāhīm despatched Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī to attack Jalāluddīn and reclaim the eastern districts. Sarwānī marched to Kalinjar,³³ which belonged to Jalāl,³⁴ and laid siege to it. Sultan Jalāluddīn immediately marched to its relief but before meeting Āzam Humayūn in battle, he addressed Malik Sarwānī a letter to this effect: "You are like a father or an uncle to me, and you know that I have committed no fault, and the breach of promise has been from the side of Sultan Ibrāhīm. The small portion of territory and wealth which he had decided to allot to me as my inheritance, on that also he has shut his eyes and broken the bond of affection.

²⁸ T.A., I, 341, 343-44; Ferishta, I, 189.

²⁹ Dorn, I, 71.

³⁰ T.A., I, 343; M.R., I, 480. T.S.A., 66 has 10 Zilhijja. T.D., 107 gives these very details in connection with Jalāl's coronation.

³¹ Cf. R.P. Tripathi, *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, 89.

³² Ferishta, I, 188.

³³ Only *Mahsun*, 75 (b), has Gwallior. All other chroniclers have Kalinjar.

³⁴ Ferishta, I, 189.

It behoves you that you should not abandon the side of justice, and should help the oppressed party."³⁵ The letter was ■ true in its contents and so importunate in its appeal that Āzam Humayūn could hardly refuse the request. Moreover, his ■ was the Vakīl of Jalāluddīn and he himself bore an ill-feeling towards Ibrāhīm.³⁶ He was also not strong enough to oppose Jalāluddīn and ■ he thought it best to join Jalāl, and raised the siege of Kalpi because of "financial weakness".³⁷

The two now began to plan their future course of action. It was decided that Jalāluddīn must re-establish his authority in Jaunpur. With that end in view their joint forces marched against the governor of Avadh, S'aid Khan, ■ of Mubārak Khan Lodī.³⁸ They attacked S'aid Khan with such alacrity that he sought safety in a precipitate flight to Lakhnau,³⁹ and reported the matter to Sultan Ibrāhīm.

To all appearances it ■ Jalāl Khan who had started off with aggression, but the fact is that he had been compelled to do so because of Ibrāhīm's breach of faith. Anyway, now open hostilities had started between the two brothers, and Ibrāhīm Lodī decided to crush Jalāl Khan in rebellion. Before leaving Agra he took the precaution of sending his brothers, whom he had earlier imprisoned at Firōzābād,⁴⁰ to the fort of Hansi,⁴¹ where they were provided

• ³⁵ T.A., I, 344; T.S.A., 69; Ferishta, I, 189. Similar is the language of *Makhzan*, 75 (b).

³⁶ T.A., I, 344; T.S.A., 69; Ferishta, I, 189.

³⁷ *Makhzan*, 75 (a).

■ On p. 342 Nizāmuddīn says that Shaikhzādā Muhammad Farmūlī was the governor of Avadh and Lakhnau, and it was to him ■ Ibrāhīm had ■ a robe of honour before starting his fight with Jalāl Khan. On p. 344 the governor of Avadh and Lakhnau, whom Jalāl attacked, is said to be S'aid Khan, ■ of Mubārak Khan Lodī. Ferishta repeats the statements on p. 188, line 25 and p. 189, line 10 respectively. Ni'amatulla aī ■ says that the governor of Avadh was S'aid Khan. The only explanation I can offer is that in all probability at the Darbar of 30 December, 1517, at which many administrative changes were effected, the governorship of Avadh and Lakhnau was transferred from Muhammad Farmūlī to S'aid Khan Lodī.

³⁸ T.A., *Makhzan* and Ferishta ■ have Lakhnau only. Only T.S.A., 70 says that he withdrew to Kara. That is not correct, for Kara ■ in the charge of Āzam Humayūn himself. Badaoni, Ranking I, 432; T.A., I, 347.

³⁹ Ferishta, I, 189, line 12; T.A., I, 344; *Makhzan* 75 (a).

⁴¹ W.M., 40 (a).

with all comforts but were kept under the strict vigilance of Daulat Khan with a contingent of 300 horse.⁴³

He left Agra on 7 January, 1518 (24 Zilhijja, 923 H)⁴⁴ with a large army. At Bhongaon he ■■■ informed that Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī and his son Fatṣh Khan, who to save their skin had deserted Jalāluddīn, were coming to join him.⁴⁵ This made Ibrāhīm Lodi extremely happy and his position quite strong. The Sultan now marched to Qannauj, where Āzam Humayūn had the honour of ■■■ interview with him. Jalāluddīn's side was greatly weakened by this desertion and he retreated to Kalpi. At Qannauj, Ibrāhīm was joined by many more nobles from Avadh, Jaunpur and Lakhnau including S'aid Khan and Shaikhzādā Farmūlī, the latter of whom had deserted Jalāl Khan. Qāsim Khan, governor of Sambhal, flushed with a recent victory over the zamindar of Jartoli,⁴⁶ also came to wait upon the Sultan.⁴⁷ Ibrāhīm Lodi now despatched Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī, Āzam Humayūn Lodi and Nāsir Khan Nūhānī with a large army against Jalāl Khan. Before they reached Kalpi, Jalāl Khan left it for Agra. Leaving the defence of Kalpi to his foster mother Ni'āmat Khatūn, Qutb Khan Lodi, Imādul Mulk and Badruddīn, Jalāluddīn marched out to Agra with thirty thousand horse and many trained elephants⁴⁸ to deliver a surprise attack ■■■ Ibrāhīm's capital denuded of its troops and without its king. It ■■■ ■ fine stroke of strategy, and gave Ibrāhīm some very anxious moments. He immediately sent Malik Ādam Kākar to save Agra promising to send reinforcements soon. Meanwhile in the absence of Jalāl Khan, Kalpi was easily taken, though not without a siege and consequent fight, which provided an incentive as well as an excuse for its sack.

Jalāluddīn learnt of the sad fate of Kalpi when he was besieging Agra. He was determined to wreak his vengeance for the sack of Kalpi by ravaging the capital of Ibrāhīm. But he ■■■ dissuaded

⁴³ Ferishta, I, 189; T.S.A., 70.

⁴⁴ Dorn, I, 72; Ferishta, I, 189; T.S.A., 70 has Rabiul Ākhir in place of Zilhijja.

⁴⁵ T.S.A., 70.

⁴⁶ In Allgarh district. The ■■■ of the Zamindar is variously given as Khan Chand or ■■■ Chand. T.A., I, 344; Dorn, I, 72; M.R., I, 481-82; *Makhzan* 76 (a-b).

⁴⁷ Ferishta, I, 189.

⁴⁸ T.S.A., 71; Ferishta, I, 189; *Makhzan*, 76 (b).

from doing so by Malik Ādam Kākar, who had been rushed to its defence by Sultan Ibrāhīm. Ādam Khan kept him off by such soft words and speeches as were pleasing to him, and gained thereby time for saving the city from pillage. Later when Malik Ism'āl, son of 'Alāuddīn Jalwānī, Kabīr Khan Lodī and Bahādur Khan Nūhānī with their contingents amounting to 18,000 horse and fifty elephants⁴⁸ arrived from Qannauj, he sent word to Jalāl to give up all pretensions to sovereignty and come to terms with Sultan Ibrāhīm. If Jalāl was agreeable to it, Ādam Khan promised to persuade the Sultan to keep him in possession of his old Jagir of Kalpi. Jalāl Khan was advised by his leading nobles and well-wishers not to accept any humiliating terms but to offer fight, for Ibrāhīm was revengeful and devoid of all good feelings.⁴⁹ But the Prince lacked both ability and strength. He was in a very good position to fight, having 30,000 brave horsemen and 160 war elephants, but even amidst vehement protests from his officers and men, he agreed to Ādam Khan's condition.⁵⁰ He gave the insignia and paraphernalia of royalty to Ādam Khan upon which his officers left him and his army dispersed. Ādam Khan took Jalāluddīn's Umbrella and Kettledrum to Sultan Ibrāhīm Lodī, who had arrived at Etawah from Qannauj, and conveyed to him the terms of agreement. Ibrāhīm was unwilling to come to any terms with Jalāl. He knew that safety lay in completely destroying his enemy and thereby once for all putting an end to the intrigues of the Afghan nobles. But his attitude was very unfair to Jalāluddīn. Ni'āmatulla avers that "out of self-conceit, arrogance, youthful vanity and abundance of military equipments", Sultan Ibrāhīm rejected these terms.⁵¹ Jalāl was now without any army and was in no position to demand fulfilment of Ādam Khan's promise. But in turning down the representation of Ādam Khan, Ibrāhīm was both indecorous and impolitic. Soon the nobles, who had served the Sultanate for long, came to know one thing—Sultan Ibrāhīm could not be trusted.

Being convinced that Ibrāhīm was not prepared to honour the terms offered by Ādam Khan, Jalāl Khan fled to seek shelter with

⁴⁸ T.S.A., 71-72; Dorn, I, 79; T.A., 346; M.R., I, 482-83.

⁴⁹ T.S.A., 72.

⁵⁰ *Makhzan*, 77 (b); Dorn, I, 73. Also T.S.A., 72.

⁵¹ *Makhzan*, 77 (b).

the Raja of Gwalior.⁵² Ibrāhīm returned to Agra. His power was firmly established. His only rival was lying low, with no chances of recuperation. The nobles who had earlier opposed him were asking for pardon and joining his service.⁵³ Since the death of Sikandar Shāh, Ibrāhīm had not been able to pay any attention to administrative affairs. Now he found time to look to that side also. He sent Haibat Khan Gurgandāz, Karīmdād Taugh and Daulat Khan Indārā⁵⁴ to administer Delhi. Shaikhzādā Manjhū⁵⁵ ■■■ despatched to wrest Chanderi from the grandson of Mahmūd Mālwi "who had failed, since Sikandar's death, to acknowledge in an adequate manner the sovereignty of Delhi".⁵⁶

Conquest of Gwalior

The Sultan then turned his attention to Gwalior. Gwalior had provided asylum to the rebel Jalāl Khan and it must be reduced. This ■■■ in consonance with the expansionist policy of the Lodi Kings. The occasion was also favourable for the brave Raja Mān Singh had recently died.⁵⁷ Besides, its reduction would add a feather to Ibrāhīm's cap for his predecessor had not been able to take it despite his best efforts.⁵⁸

The Sultan deputed Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī, governor of Kara, to march against Gwalior with 30,000 cavalry and 300 elephants.⁵⁹ Many other officers like Bhīkhan Khan, son of 'Ālam Khan Lodi, Sulaimān Farmūlī and Khan-i-Jahān were also sent to support Āzam Humayūn.⁶⁰ On arrival at Gwalior the royal commander laid siege to the fort. Raja Mān's son and successor Vikramāditya, was an illustrious son of a distinguished father. He strengthened the defences of the fort. The besiegers shot fireballs and rockets (*haqqahā*) into the outer citadel of Bādalgārh while the Rajputs

⁵² T.A., I, 346; T.S.A., 73.

⁵³ T.A., I, 346; Ferishta, I, 189; T.S.A., 73.

⁵⁴ T.A., I, 347; Ferishta, 189. Also T.S.A., 72. The spelling of Indārā differs in T.A. and Ferishta.

■■■ Manjhū means the middling, the young.

⁵⁵ Ferishta, I, 190; C.H.I., III, 248. *Makhzan*, 78 (a).

⁵⁶ T.S.A., 74-75; *Makhzan*, 78 (b). ■■■ T.A., I, 347.

⁵⁷ T.A., I, 347-48; Ferishta, I, 190. *Makhzan*, 78 (b) has 350 elephants.

⁵⁸ T.A., I, 347-48; *Makhzan*, 78 (b).

retaliated by hurling at the enemy burning bags of cotton soaked in oil, and many ■■■■ burnt to death on both sides.⁶¹ While the siege was in full swing Jalāl Khan, not to embarrass his host any more, left for Malwa.⁶² Meanwhile the royalists had mined the walls. They effected many breaches and with the help of *sabāts* entered the outer walls of the fortress.⁶³ Finding further resistance impossible, Vikramāditya started negotiations for peace. Ibrāhīm treated the Tomar chief well. Though he deprived him of Gwalior, he assigned to him the fief of Shamsābād.⁶⁴

Sultan Ibrāhīm had been greatly annoyed at the escape of Jalāl Khan and suspected in it the hand of his nobles at Gwalior including Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī. Therefore, a little before the reduction of Bādālgarh, he had ordered the recall of Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī and his son Fatḥ Khan⁶⁵, and on their arrival at Agra had put both of them behind bars.⁶⁶ Although in the past Āzam Humayūn had made himself notorious by his shifting loyalties, yet he had made amends by faithfully serving the Sultan for many months past. Nay, even knowing what was in store for him, he had obeyed the orders of the Sultan and had returned to Agra.⁶⁷ Thus Āzam Humayūn's complicity in Jalāl's escape was perhaps only a baseless suspicion.

In fact Ibrāhīm Lodi had started a policy of persecution of such noblemen about whose loyalty he entertained even the remotest

⁶¹ T.S.A., 83-84.

⁶² Badaoni, Ranking, I, 432 and Ferishta, I, 190 give an impression that he left before the siege began. But Niāmatalā says that "Jalāl Khan, unable ■ bear the blows . . . went to Malwa". *Makhzan*, 79 (a).

⁶³ There they found a brazen bull, which the Hindus had worshipped for years. It was ■ to Agra wherefrom the Sultan ordered it to be taken to Delhi and placed at the Baghdād gate. Up to the time of Akbar it was there, and Nizāmuddin claims to have seen it. Badaoni claims to have ■ it too, but he says that he saw it at Fatehpur (Sikri) where it had been removed in 992 H. A. D. 1584. Later, by orders of Akbar, it was converted into gongs and bells and implements of all kinds. T.A., I, 348; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 432-33. Also *Makhzan*, 79 (a). T.S.A., 75.

⁶⁴ C.I.S.G., I, 234; Ferishta, I, 190. ■ gesture touched Vikramāditya. He remained firmly attached to Ibrāhīm and died fighting in his cause against Bābur at Panipat. Ferishta, I, 205; B.N. (B), II, 477.

■ Ferishta, I, 190 line 13, wrongly has Qutluḡ Khan.

⁶⁵ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 433; W.M., 40 (a).

■ T.S.A., 84-86.

suspicion. A little before Āzam's incarceration, he had imprisoned his Vazīr, Miān Bhuā. Son of the respectable Khawās Khan, Miān Bhuā had been the Vazīr and trusted councillor of Sikandar Lodī for no less than twenty-eight years; and there does not seem to have been any definite charge against him. Ni'āmatulla accuses him of indifference towards the Sultan. He also says that the onset of old age, and consequent infirmity of limbs and sight, had rendered him unfit for the exacting duties of his responsible office.⁶⁸ But physical infirmity was not a crime to merit incarceration. 'Abdulla even goes on to say that Bhuā was in league with Daulat Khan Lodī of the Punjab, and made no efforts to win him over to the side of Sultan Ibrāhīm. On the contrary he had begun to show signs of disobedience.⁶⁹ Whatever the reasons, the old and venerable Vazīr was put in "several maunds of chain" and to add insult to injury he was placed in charge of a subordinate of his, Malik Ādam.⁷⁰ True the Sultan gave to Bhuā's son the office of Vazīr, but that was only trying to correct one wrong with another. No loyalty could be expected from one whose blind old father was in jail.

The treatment meted out to Shahzādā Jalāl Khan is equally revolting. After his departure from Gwalior the prince had gone to seek shelter with Mahmūd Khaljī II of Malwa. At that time Mahmūd was fighting for his life and throne against Medinī Rai, his Vazīr and councillor, who had become all powerful in Malwa. Mahmūd could hardly pay any attention to Jalāl Khan, and the latter retired towards the east. When he arrived at Garha Katanga⁷¹ near Jabalpur, its Gond king Sangrām Shāh⁷² imprisoned him and

⁶⁸ T.A., I, 347. *Makhzan*, 78 (a).

⁶⁹ T.D., 113-114, 143. The *Afsān-i-Shāhān* relates an incident bearing upon Miān Bhuā's behaviour. It says that once Sultan Ibrāhīm ordered the Vazīr to pay a few lacs of rupees to the son of Raja Mān. The Vazīr was reluctant to pay and observed that "The monarch accumulates treasure as a matter of policy and spends it on proper objects. It is not desirable that money should be spent without good reason." At this the Sultan flew into a rage. *Afsān-i-Shāhān*, 45 (b) cited in Tripathi, *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration*, 192-93 and translated in Hindi in *Uttar Tīmūr Kālm Bharat*, I, 386-87.

⁷⁰ T.A., I, 347.

⁷¹ For the location of Garha Katanga see Appendix D.

⁷² Persian chroniclers do not give the name of the Gond king, but he was

sent him to Agra⁷³ to gain the goodwill of the Emperor. Ibrāhīm Lodī held an impressive Darbār in which his brother was brought with his hands bound behind him. He was ordered to be incarcerated in the fort of Hansi where, it may be recalled, other brothers of Ibrāhīm Lodī were already imprisoned. On the way to Hansi, Jalāl Khan was murdered by poisoning.⁷⁴

A retrospective glance at the relations between these two brothers leaves no doubt in one's mind that Ibrāhīm Shāh had always been guilty of breach of promise. It was he who had repudiated the convention dividing the kingdom between the two. It was again he who had violated the terms on which Ādam Khan, negotiating for the Sultan, had secured Jalāl's submission. In the end also, while pretending to send Jalāl Khan to Hansi as prisoner, he had got him murdered. Ibrāhīm's treatment of his other brothers also does not do him credit. We do not hear of their release even after the trouble with Jalāl was over. In all probability they perished in their dungeons, except for Mahmūd who was placed on the throne for some time on Bābur's arrival in Hindustan.

The arrest of Miān Bhuā and the assassination of Jalāl Khan, though acts of heinous cruelty in themselves, were nothing compared to the uncalled for arrest of Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī and his son. In ordering their confinement the Sultan had brought the hornets' nest about his ears. True Āzam Humayūn had joined Jalāl Khan formerly, but he had made sufficient expiation by deserting him and fighting for the Sultan. His work in Gwalior was also without blemish and his arrest, which he had courted with a hero's grace,⁷⁵ was simply revolting. The mere fact that "at this time Sultan Ibrāhīm had lost faith in the Amīrs of his father's, and he imprisoned most of the great Khans",⁷⁶ is no justification for such deeds of deliberate provocation. Veteran nobles were being incarcerated and killed and a new class of parvenus was coming up—this was

certainly Sangram Shāh. Sangram Shāh came to power in 1480 and ruled beyond A. D. 1530. His capital was at Garha near Jabalpur and he had 32 districts (garhas) under his control.

For a history of the Rajes of Garha-Mandala see J.A.S.B., VI, 1837, 621 ■. Also Imp. Gaz., Central Provinces, 1908, 13, 197, 209, 229.

⁷³ T.A., I, 348; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 433; Ferishta, I, 190.

⁷⁴ T.A., I, 348; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 433; *Makhzan*, 79 (a).

⁷⁵ T.D., Trs. in N.B. Roy, 181.

⁷⁶ T.A., I, 349.

the complaint of senior men like Miān Husain.⁷⁷ They felt that Ibrāhīm had failed to "appreciate the merit of the well-wishers of his father's time".⁷⁸ If Ibrāhīm felt that he could completely crush the senior nobles or do without them, he was thoroughly mistaken. According to 'Abdulla, by such acts of his Ibrāhīm "pulled down with his own hands the bulwarks of his kingdom".

In such an atmosphere of suspicion on the part of the Sultan and intrigue and defiance ■ that of the nobles, Ibrāhīm could hardly succeed in war against neighbouring rulers. He had started with high hopes against the Raja of Gwalior, but had thought it politic to be generous towards him. His war against Rana Sangrām Singh of Mewar met with still less success. It weakened his resources and damaged his reputation.

Ibrāhīm and Rana Sāngā

We have already referred to the strength and influence of Rana Sāngā of Mewar in an earlier context. Supreme ■ he was in the whole of Rajasthan, Sāngā had also extended his influence in the decaying State of Malwa by taking up the cause of Medinī Rai. But the Lodīs had also been casting longing looks on the territories of this neighbouring State. They had already occupied Chanderi and Narwar and had missed the acquisition of Ranthambhor by a narrow margin. Thus both the Lodīs and the Sisodiyās had their eyes on Malwa and a conflict between them was inevitable.

Ibrāhīm had inherited the animosity of Rana Sāngā from his father Sikandar Lodi. To do away with the dominance of Medinī Rai in Malwa, its ruler Mahmūd Khalji II had sought help from the king of Gujarat and his nobles Behjat Khan and Muhāfiz Khan from Sikandar Lodi of Delhi to fight the forces of Sangrām Singh whom Medinī Rai had invited to come to his rescue. In the end the king of Gujarat was defeated, the forces of Delhi were compelled to retire, and Medinī Rai was reinstated.⁷⁹ That is how conflict between Mewar and Delhi had started. After the death of Sikandar Lodi the Sultanate ■ faced with a serious civil war between Ibrāhīm and his brother Jalāluddīn. Rana Sāngā could not fail

⁷⁷ T.S.A., 81. ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁷⁹ Ferishta, II, 263-65; T.A., III, 383-395.

to take advantage of the situation and started his encroachments upon the territory of the Sultanate.⁸⁰ Ibrāhīm immediately marched against the Raja, fought a hotly contested engagement at Khatoli near Gwalior,⁸¹ but had to beat a retreat. The Rajputs had scored a victory and had captured Ghayāsuddīn, a prince of the Lodi royal family, but Rana Sāngā had been crippled in this engagement. He had lost his left arm by a sword cut and an arrow had made him lame for life.

The Rana was ■ a rage after this battle. Ibrāhīm was also keen on getting back the Lodi prince who, it was reported, had been set up by the Rana ■ a rival candidate for the Delhi throne.⁸² So the next year (1518-19), the Sultan renewed hostilities against Sangrām Singh. Miān Mākhan, Husain Khan, Miān M'arūf and Husain Khan Farmūli were sent at the head of a mighty force towards Rajputana.⁸³ Near Dholpur the Rana's army was contacted. From the very beginning the Rajputs had the upper hand in many stray battles. The Lodi officers were not united in opinion and action. Miān Mākhan was comparatively young, and Husain and M'arūf had felt aggrieved at their supersession.⁸⁴ The climax was reached when Miān Husain Farmūli, fearing arrest at the hands of Miān Mākhan, deserted to the side of the Rana.⁸⁵ This defection made the Rana's task easy and he inflicted ■ crushing defeat on the royal forces. According to 'Abdulla, Miān Husain even led the Rana's forces in pursuing Miān Mākhan as far as Bayana.⁸⁶ On learning of this disaster, Ibrāhīm started for the scene of action.⁸⁷ The presence of the Sultan in the camp raised the morale of his men and also encouraged Miān Husain to rejoin him. His decision was also the direct result of the slights he had experienced at the

⁸⁰ Har ■ Sārdā, *Rana Sāngā*, 56.

⁸¹ Khatoli was included in the Sarkar of Gwalior in the time of Akbar. Ain., II, 127.

For details of the war see Ojha, *Rajputānā Ka Itihās*, II, 663 and Sārdā, *op. cit.*, 56.

⁸² W.M., 63 (a). ⁸³ Ojha, *op. cit.*, II, 663-64.

⁸⁴ T.D., 116. ⁸⁵ W.M., 59 (a).

⁸⁶ T.S.A., 82-3; W.M., 61 (a), 65 (a). In the narrative of this campaign all the chroniclers are incoherent and confused. Also E and D, V, 20 a.

■ T.D., 118; Tod., *op. cit.*, II, 349-50.

Rāna's court.⁶⁰ A few indecisive battles between the rival forces, put a stop to the war. This finds corroboration in Tod who gives Barkole and Gattoli as the sites of the battles. He adds that after the last battle Bayana became the northern boundary of Mewar, which had Sinder river to the east and touched Malwa on the south.⁶¹ When after some time the Sultan ordered the murder of Chanderi's governor, Miān Husain Farmāī, the Rana occupied this southernmost outpost of the Lodi Kingdom also.⁶²

Sultan Ibrāhīm lost in this war both materially and in reputation. Colonel Tod credits Rana Sāngā with winning eighteen pitched battles against the kings of Delhi and Malwa. The battles mentioned above were a few of these, and they undoubtedly affected the Sultan's position and prestige. Internally too his government was weakened by his constant friction with the nobles.

Nobles in Revolt

We have — the injustice of the imprisonment of Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī and his son Fatḥ Khān at the hands of the Sultan. At the news of the disgrace of Āzam Humayūn, his son Islām Khān unfurled the standard of revolt at Kara.⁶³ He seized the treasure, arms and stores of Kara and enlisted a number of good and experienced soldiers. With the strong force so collected, he defeated in battle Ahmad Khān, whom the Sultan had sent against him.

⁶⁰ Rizqulla relates many incidents of Miān Husain's slights. One such is that once many Hindu and Muslim officers were sitting in the Rana's camp. Ghayṣuddīn, the Sultan's brother who had deserted, was also there. Presently the exultant cry of "Ram, Ram" arose from the side of the Hindus and the Muslims also joined in the refrain. It greatly hurt Miān Husain's feelings as a Muslim. W.M., 63 (a).

Another is that one day Miān Husain sent a message to the Rana through Miān Tah expressing a wish to see him. Tah saw many people including Ghayṣuddīn busy conversing in Rana Sāngā's tent, but he was told that the time was not suitable and that the Rana had retired for rest. At this Husain felt greatly humiliated. W.M., 63 (b).

⁶¹ Tod, II, 349; W.M., 61 (b).

⁶² B.N. (B), II, 593; W.M., 64 (a). Also Ojha, II, 666 and Erskine, *Babur and Humayun*, I, 480.

⁶³ T.A., I, 349; Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 433-34; *Makhzan*, 79 (b); *Farišta*, I, 190. Only W.M., 40 (b) has Fatḥ Khān in place of Islām Khān.

Worse still, having heard of the cruel treatment of nobles like Sarwānī and Bhuā, Āzam Humayūn Lodī⁸³ and S'ajd Khan Lodī fled from the Sultan's camp to their Jagirs in Lakhnau, and joining hands with Islām Khan began to fan the flames of rebellion in the east. Because of their activities the whole of Avadh, from Kara to Qannauj, was up in arms against the Sultan.⁸⁴ Whatever the responsibility of the king in the creation of such a situation, he took immediate steps to curb the insurrection. He built up a large force and placed it under ■■■ young nobles as the older ones had proved to be undependable. The young commanders included Ahmad Khan, brother of Āzam Humayūn Lodī (in rebellion), sons of Husain Farmūli, Dilāwar Khan, son of Ahmad Khan (recently defeated by Islām Khan), Qutb Khan, ■■■ of Ghāzi Khan Jalwānī, Bhīkan Khan Nūhānī, and Sikandar, ■■■ of Ādam Kākar.⁸⁵ Thus the royal commanders included officers of all tribes of Afghans. They might have been so selected as to keep ■ watch over one another. It also shows that the loyalists did not belong to any particular section and comprehended all sections of the nobility. The army was ordered to quell the insurrection.

On their way to the east, the royal army was ambushed at Bangarmau near Qannauj.⁸⁶ Iqbāl Khan, a cavalry commander (Khasa, Khaif) of Āzam Humayūn Lodī, suddenly came out of his ambush with 5,000 and killed and wounded ■ large number of royalists (A. D. 1519).⁸⁷ This discomfiture evoked a just reprimand from the Sultan, who, while sending them fresh reinforcements, warned them not to return without achieving their objective.⁸⁸ Stung to the quick and sufficiently strengthened, the royalists resumed their march. The rebel forces by now had swelled to 40,000 horse and 500 elephants.⁸⁹ As the two armies lay facing each other, everybody could see that the battle was going to be

⁸³ Āzam Humayūn was only a title and not a name.

⁸⁴ T.A., I, 349; *Makhzan*, 79 (b).

⁸⁵ T.A.I, 349; also Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 434. T.D., 114, has twelve names. Also *Makhzan*, 80 (a).

⁸⁶ Bangarmau lies half way ■ the road joining Hardoi and Unao.

⁸⁷ T.S.A., 76; M.R., I, 485. *Ferishta*, I, 190.

⁸⁸ Dorn, I, 75. *Makhzan*, ■ (a).

⁸⁹ T.A., I, 350; *Ferishta*, I, 190; T.S.A., 77; M.R., I, 486; *Makhzan*, 80 (a).

sanguinary. Shaikh Yūsuf Qattāl, a leading contemporary saint,¹⁰⁰ intervened between them and advised the rebels to come to terms with the Monarch. They agreed to do so on the condition that Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī was released from prison,¹⁰⁰ but the Sultan, who insisted on their unconditional surrender, refused to come to terms with them. At the same time he ordered Dariyā Khan Nūhānī, governor of Bihar, Nāsir Khan Nūhānī of Ghazipur and Shaikhzādā Muhammad Farmūlī to advance upon the rebels from the east. With their advance the rebel forces were sandwiched between two loyal armies. The forces fighting on the side of the Sultanate were now in a position of vantage which they had gained through the initiative of the Sultan as well as the complacency of the enemy. On the day of the battle the two sides were locked in mortal conflict, "and shed such streams of blood, that the eyes of the age became blind and old an beholding it".¹⁰¹ In the words of Ni'āmatulla, "For many years such a sanguinary action had not occurred in Hindustan. . . . Dead bodies, heap upon heap, covered the field, . . . and streams of blood ran over the plain. Brother against brother, and father against son, urged by mutual rivalry and inborn bravery, mixed in the conflict; and restraining their hands from long arrow and spear, they contended only with dagger, sword and knife. In that battle 10,000 gallant Afghans fell on both sides."¹⁰² Islām Khan ■■■ killed and Sa'īd Khan with a number of rebel chiefs was captured by the soldiers of Dariyā Khan Nūhānī.¹⁰³ Thus the rebel forces were utterly routed, and the insurrection suppressed. All chroniclers have moralised on the ingratitude of the rebels,¹⁰⁴ but none has blamed the cruelty and obstinacy

¹⁰⁰ Nizāmuddin and Ferishta give the name of the saint as Shaikh Rājū ■■■■■. According to 'Abdul Haqq, Salyyad Sadrud-dīn Rājū Qattāl Bukhārī was the son of Salyyad Ahmad Kabir. He obtained the gaddi from his brother Makhdūm Jahāniyān. *Akhbārul Akhyār*, 150.

But Rājū Qattāl Bukhārī had died in A. D. 1423 (827 H), almost a century before the present war. The saint who intervened was most probably Yūsuf Qattāl who died at Delhi in A. D. 1527 (933 H).

Akhbārul Akhyār, 219.

¹⁰⁰ T.A., I, 350; T.S.A., 77; Ferishta, I, 190.

¹⁰¹ T.A., I, 350; Also T.S.A., 77.

¹⁰² *Makhzan*, 81 (a); Dorn, I, 76. Also E and D, V, 15 n. 4.

■ T.S.A., 77; *Makhzan*, 81 (b).

■ T.A., I, 350; Ferishta, I, 190; T.S.A., 77.

of the Sultan in fanning this civil war. He might have found satisfaction in the fact that this war had broken the backbone of the rebellious nobility. In fact he felt exceedingly happy on the occasion and profusely rewarded those who had fought on his side.¹⁰⁵ Little did he realise that such a great conflict, in which the flower of the army had been lost, was bound to affect the strength and stability of his own Empire.

Ibrāhīm's success only prompted him to destroy those remaining barons whose loyalty he suspected. Some of them had fought for him in the last war, but that did not win for them the confidence of the Sultan. His nature was certainly suspicious, although it is difficult to correctly apportion the blame between the king and the barons for the sad state of affairs. All the same Ibrāhīm's not too short a reign of nine years was spent in fighting a fruitless and disastrous war with his own nobility.

In pursuance of his vindictive policy Sultan Ibrāhīm got Husain Khan Farmūlī murdered by some low Shaikhzādā at Chanderi.¹⁰⁶ He even rewarded the assassin with 700 gold coins and ten villages.¹⁰⁷ This murder created great alarm coming as it did close on the death of Miān Bhuā and Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī in prison under very suspicious circumstances. It was reported that a gunpowder plot had been hatched and these unsuspecting prisoners had been induced to shift to a cell in which they were blown to pieces.¹⁰⁸ Suspicion breeds suspicion and these murders created widespread consternation, and disaffection increased all the more. Dariyā Khan Nūhānī, governor of Bihar, Khan-i-Jahān Lodī and others like them unfurled the standard of revolt in the east.¹⁰⁹ These were the barons who had fought for the Sultanate in the last war, but their loyalty was now undermined. The situation only worsened with Dariyā Khan Nūhānī's death shortly after. His son, Bahādur Shāh¹¹⁰ declared complete independence in Bihar. He took the title of Sultan Muhammad and instituted the Khutba¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ T.A., I, 351.

¹⁰⁶ T.A., I, 351; Badaoni, *Ranking*, I, 435; Ferishta, I, 191; *Makhzan*, 82 (b).

¹⁰⁷ E and D, V, 20 n. T.S.A., 75-76; T.D., 122-23.

¹⁰⁸ T.S.A., 86; Dorn, I, 76.

¹¹⁰ M.R., I, 487; *Makhzan*, 82 (a). T.S.A., 87 wrongly calls him Shahbār Khan. W.M., 41 (a) has Bihar Khan.

¹¹¹ W.M., 41 (a).

and issued coins in his own name. He was readily joined by many Amīrs who had forsaken allegiance to Delhi, and the forces under him soon swelled to one hundred thousand horse.¹¹² He reduced to submission the whole of the upper Ganga country from Bihar to Sambhal,¹¹³ situated as close as eighty miles from Delhi as the crow flies. Nāsir Khan Nūhānī, the governor of Ghāzīpur, being defeated by Miān Mustafā¹¹⁴ on orders from Sultan Ibrāhīm, also went over to Muhammad Shāh. Other disaffected nobles of the eastern region also flocked to Muhammad Shāh.¹¹⁵ With time Muhammad Shāh's power went on increasing in Bihar.

The east having got out of control and the Rajputs having become too strong in the south and west (with Bayana having become the boundary between the Sultanate and Rana Sāngā's dominions), Ibrāhīm must have felt deeply distressed. The *de facto* ruler of Bihar had fought several battles with the forces of the Sultanate and had ■■■ off with flying colours.¹¹⁶ In these circumstances Sultan Ibrāhīm sent for Daulat Khan Lodī, son of Tātār Khan and governor of the Punjab for the last twenty years,¹¹⁷ ■■■ all probability for consultations and help. But Daulat Khan was scared by the happenings in eastern Hindustan, and being in arrears, he avoided coming. Instead, he sent his youngest ■■■ Dilāwar Khan to Agra. Sultan Ibrāhīm at once guessed the reasons for Daulat's excuse of absence, and threatened Dilāwar and his father with dire consequences if the latter did not obey his orders. Dilāwar, greatly alarmed, managed to escape to Lahore and related to his father what had transpired between Ibrāhīm and himself. Daulat Khan could clearly see what was in store for him. To escape from the wrath of the Sultan, he, in 1523, invited Bābur from Kabul to destroy the power of Ibrāhīm Lodī.

Ordinarily it would have sufficed to discuss Bābur's relations with

¹¹² T.A., I, 351; Dorn, I, 76; Ferishta, I, 191. T.S.A., 87 has only 70,000.

¹¹³ T.A., I, 351; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 435.

¹¹⁴ This Miān Mustafā was the brother of Shaiikh Bayezīd Farmūlī who made himself conspicuous under Bābur.

¹¹⁵ Dorn, I, 76.

¹¹⁶ T.A., I, 351; Ferishta, I, 191; *Makhzan*, 82 (a).

¹¹⁷ T.S.A., 87. Tātār Khan, it may be remembered, was ■■■ of the leading Afghan nobles of the Punjab who had helped in the elevation of Bahāl Lodī to the throne.

India from about this date. But since the Mughal conqueror had already carried out a number of raids into north-western Hindustan, it would be proper to study, howsoever briefly, such events of his early career as have a bearing on his conquest of India.

Bābur's Invasion of Hindustan

Zahīr-ud-dīn Muhammad Bābur¹¹⁰ had descended from two mighty empire-builders—Tīmūr ■ the paternal side and Chingiz Khan on the maternal—fourth in descent from the former and fourteenth generations from the latter. He was born on 14 February, 1483 (6 Muharram, ■ H) at Andijān, capital of Farghānā, his father's fertile kingdom, now a small state in Russian Turkistan. Bābur's grandfather Abū S'ayid Mirzā, after constant conflicts, had come to possess the Mawārunnehr ■ Transoxiana, which on his death in A. D. 1469 ■ divided amongst his sons, one of whom was Bābur's father 'Umar Shaikh Mirzā. 'Umar Shaikh obtained the kingdom of Farghānā. Caution and patience were equally denied to him, and he constantly intrigued and fought against his brothers. His unwisdom invited against him a joint attack by his brother and brother-in-law, Sultan Ahmad Mirzā and Sultan Mahmūd Khan. While their armies lay on the outskirts of Farghānā, 'Umar Shaikh died on 8 June, 1494, when a pigeon cot collapsed with him inside it. Curiously enough his death saved his kingdom. The two uncles of Bābur had hated his father. They bore no grudge against their eleven-year-old nephew, who now became the ruler of Farghānā.

Environment, lineage and tradition had made Bābur ■ seasoned warrior even at that tender age, and although we know little of his early training in the arts of reading and writing, yet his Memoirs¹¹¹ leave no doubt that in that field too his education had been excellent.

¹¹⁰ Meaning in Turki the "Tiger". In Arabic Bābur means a "lion" and the two should not be confused. V.A. Smith, *Akbar the Great Mogul*, 9, n. 2; Rushbrook Williams, *An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century*, 19 n. 1; Steingass, *Persian-English Dictionary*.

¹¹¹ For the history of Bābur there is ■ work more authentic than his own Memoirs. They are so interesting and yet so true that they "must be reckoned among the most enthralling and romantic works in the literature of all time". Denison Ross in C.H.I., IV, 20. Also Edwards, *Babur, Diarist and Despot*, 13.

His early years as ruler were spent in fighting his cousins and other relations. Like his father 'Umar Shaikh, Bābur was ever dreaming of possessing Samargand, "indissolubly associated with the glory and greatness of Amīr Tīmūr".¹²⁰ In 1497 he defeated his cousin Baisunqar and occupied Samargand, but the latter invited to his rescue Shaibānī Khan, chief of the Uzbeks. Shaibānī rendered little help to Baisunqar, but himself snatched Samargand from Bābur, who had to retreat to Tashkent, a virtual fugitive (1501). Bābur was not strong enough to face Shaibānī, and yet he could not sit idle. So he moved south-eastwards and occupied Kabul (1502-3). "We are justified in assuming," writes Sir Denison Ross, "that it was while Bābur was bringing order into his new kingdom . . . that he was first inspired with his Indian dream".¹²¹ In January, 1505, he marched through the Khyber Pass and arrived at Derā Ghāzī Khan, taking Kohāt and Tabrīk on the way. He was back in Kabul in May 1505 after this successful campaign in the east.¹²² It is significant that an expedition to India was seriously thought of as early as 1505. For full twenty years thereafter the pendulum of Bābur's desires swung between the east and the west. During this period his chief interest lay in Central Asian politics, but urged by the force of circumstances he had occasions of marching across the Indian frontier.¹²³

Of the five expeditions to Hindustan referred to by Bābur in his Memoirs,¹²⁴ the first two took place in A. D. 1519. Early in that year he crossed the Indus and Jhelum, and seized Bhīra and Khushāb from 'Alī Khan, son of Daulat Khan Lodi. From Bhīra, Bābur despatched one Mullā Murshid to Delhi asking Ibrāhīm Lodi to surrender to him the West Punjab which he claimed as his ancestral dominion conquered by Tīmūr. In return for this Ibrāhīm was to be left undisturbed in his Empire.¹²⁵ But the envoy was not permitted to proceed beyond Lahore by Daulat Khan Lodi, who stood to lose the Punjab if the proposal was accepted or to bear the brunt of Bābur's attack if it was refused. Indeed Daulat Khan

¹²⁰ R. Williams, *op. cit.*, 37. ¹²¹ C.H.I., IV, 5.

¹²² On page 5 of the C.H.I., IV, the date of Bābur's return to Kabul is given as May, 1506, while on page 10 it is given as May, 1505. The latter is correct. Also R. Williams, 82.

¹²³ B.N. (B), I, 341-43.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 478-79; (L and E), 309.

¹²⁵ *Farishta*, I, 201

could hardly bear to — his Punjab being bargained between Bābur and Ibrāhīm.¹²⁸ Thus while Bābur's message never reached Delhi, he was forced to return to Kabul where pressing problems required his immediate attention. However, in September the same year he again marched against the Yūsufzais through the Khyber Pass. "Apparently this was his second expedition."¹²⁹

Bābur's Memoirs here break off for the next five years, but it was in 1520 that he undertook his third expedition to India.¹³⁰ From Kabul he marched straight to Bhīra and thence to Sialkot. Sialkot submitted readily and the town was spared, but Saiyidpur (Aminābād) was stormed and its inhabitants massacred. Bābur spent the next two years in the west, fighting Shāh Arghūn, and at last acquired Qandhar towards the end of 1522.¹³¹ The situation had now completely changed. Shaibānī Khan Uzbeq, the bitterest enemy of Bābur, was now no more.¹³² The Arghūn Sultan was dead and Persia had become a friendly ally. Bābur could now concentrate his attention on Hindustan.

It was about this time that "the whole of the eastern provinces from Badaon to Bihar, — in the hands of the rebels . . . and Rana Sangrām Singh had become unduly strong in the region south-west of Agra".¹³³ Daulat Khan, 'Ālam Khan and Rana Sāngā knew what Bābur's intentions were, and yet to destroy Ibrāhīm, they encouraged him in his designs on India. Daulat Khan's son Dillāwar met Bābur at Kabul¹³⁴ and suggested that (while Daulat was to be left undisturbed in the Punjab) Ibrāhīm should be deposed and his uncle 'Ālam Khan be set up as the Sultan of Delhi in his stead. 'Ālam Khan, an uncle of Ibrāhīm Lodi, had earlier rebelled against Sikandar Shāh and had fled to Gujārat.¹³⁵ In 1524 he was invited

¹²⁸ T.S.A., 89; B.N. (B), II, 451-61.

¹²⁹ R. Williams, 115-16.

¹³⁰ B.N. (L and E), 286. Ferishta, I, 201-2 also calls this Bābur's third expedition and places it in 1520 (926 H).

¹³¹ Ferishta, I, 201; Erskine, *op. cit.*, I, 335-36.

¹³² B.N. (B), I, 350 & n.

¹³³ B.N. (L and E), 287.

— 'Abdulla says that Dillāwar Khan, after his flight from Agra, went straight to Bābur without even meeting his father. According to Ahmad Yādgār, Daulat Khan sent him to Bābur, while according to Nizāmuddīn and Nihāwandī, Daulat Khan himself went to Bābur at Kabul. T.D., 129; T.S.A., 88; T.A., I, 351; M.R., I, 487.

¹³⁴ For 'Ālam Khan's hectic career see *Mitrā-i-Sikandarī*, Eng. Trs., 277:

by the disgruntled Delhi Amīrs and induced to assume the title of Sultan 'Alāuddīn. 'Ālam Khan's proposal to Bābur (whom he also had gone to meet at Kabul)¹³⁴ was that Bābur should help him secure the throne by defeating Ibrāhīm, and in return for his aid should retain the Punjab.¹³⁵ Probably about this very time Bābur also received an envoy from Rana Sāngā inviting the former to remove Ibrāhīm Lodī from the throne.¹³⁶ Whatever the sequence of these overtures, Bābur knew that India would readily fall since everybody wanted Ibrāhīm to go. And he decided upon his fourth expedition to Hindustan, apparently to support 'Ālam Khan against Ibrāhīm Lodī.

Knowledge of these transactions prompted Ibrāhīm Lodī to make preparations to face the situation. He suspended his operations against the rebels in the east, and sent an army under Bihar Khan, Mubārak Khan Lodī and Bhīkhan Khan Nūhānī to the Punjab.¹³⁷ Its task was to bring the rebel Daulat Khan to book, as well as to repel any foreign invader. The imperial commanders drove out Daulat Khan from Lahore and occupied it. Meanwhile Bābur, having marched through Khyber and reducing the whole country up to Lahore, stood before it (1524). Ibrāhīm's army, which had recently occupied the city, gave him battle, but it was defeated. Bābur sacked Lahore and then burnt it.¹³⁸ Four days later he marched to Deopulpur, attacked it and put the garrison to the sword.

At Deopulpur, Daulat Khan, who after his defeat by the Delhi army had fled to Multan, came to wait upon Bābur but not in any happy mood. He had sought Ibrāhīm's ruin, but it was his own Punjab that Bābur had now occupied. His disappointment was complete when Bābur assigned to him Jalandhar and Sultanpur, but kept to himself the possession of Lahore. Daulat Khan could never reconcile himself to this arrangement, and began to plan for an attack on Bābur. But, strangely enough, Daulat's own son

J.W., I, 120.

Nizāmuddīn wrongly calls him the son of Sikandar Lodī. T.A., De, III, 220.

¹³⁴ Dorn, I, 77; Badaoni, I, 331; M.R., I, 496.

¹³⁵ Ferishta, I, 203. — B.N. (B), II, 529.

¹³⁷ B.N. (L and E), 287; Ferishta, I, —.

¹³⁸ On — January, 1524 (30 Rabi'ul Awwal, 930 H); B.N. (B), I, 447.

Dilāwar informed Bābur about Daulat's plans and Bābur punished Daulat Khan severely. However, for the time being he could not further his plans of conquest because of pressing problems at home, and placing Lahore, Sialkot and Kalanaur under his own officers and Deopapur under 'Ālam Khan, he returned to Kabul.

Bābur is in a position of vantage in condemning Daulat Khan Lodi's acts of "treachery", for he has convincingly put forward his point of view in his Memoirs. Daulat Khan has left no record of what he must have felt at the loss of Lahore. If he had, he must have declared Bābur's occupation of Lahore as ■ extremely treacherous act. In view of this, Bābur's repeated assertion of the treacherous conduct of Daulat Khan and other Afghan noblemen (and later on of Rana Sāngā) should be taken only with ■ pinch of salt.

No sooner had Bābur left for Kabul, than Daulat Khan emerged from his hilly retreat. He could not depend upon Bābur any more, but had gone too far ■ his antagonism for Ibrāhīm to join hands with him in spite of a letter from the latter. In that Ibrāhīm had reminded him of the kindness of the Lodi Sultans to the house of Daulat Khan and had reproached him for inviting a foreigner to settle the affairs of the Afghans. But Daulat Khan only clamped the blame for the unhappy situation on Ibrāhīm himself saying: "It is not me, but improper acts of yours that have brought the Mughals into this country".¹³⁹ Disgraced by Bābur, but disowning Ibrāhīm, Daulat Khan began a struggle in isolation to re-establish his position. He defeated his son Dilāwar and seized Sultānpur. He also drove out 'Ālam Khan from Deopapur, and attacked Sialkot which, however, he failed to take.

'Ālam Khan, after his defeat at the hands of Daulat Khan, went to Bābur at Kabul and returned with instructions for Bābur's officers stationed in the Punjab to help him in securing the throne of Delhi.¹⁴⁰ This development alarmed Daulat Khan, who seduced 'Ālam Khan to his side by promising to make him the Sultan of Delhi without his resorting to any foreign aid. 'Ālam Khan (entitled Sultan 'Ālāuddīn) and Daulat Khan now marched with 40,000 horse to attack Delhi.¹⁴¹ They delivered ■ night attack on

¹³⁹ T.S.A., 92-93.

¹⁴⁰ *Ferishta*, I, 202-3.

¹⁴¹ T.D., 130-31; T.S.A., 93; T.A., II, 3-4.

the Delhi army led by Ibrāhīm Lodī in person, and routed it. But next morning Ibrāhīm, by sheer courage and efficient handling of the situation, humbled the superior force of the enemy by a surprise attack when the latter was busy in loot and plunder.¹⁴³

Such was the situation when Bābur set out, on Friday, 17 November, 1525 (1 Safar, 932 H) "to invade Hindustan".¹⁴⁴ He seems to have been impatient to do so, for he severely rebuked Humayūn, his eldest son, for his dilatory march.¹⁴⁵ He crossed the Indus on 16 December (1 Rabiul Awwal) with a force of twelve thousand men.¹⁴⁶ He crossed the Jhelum and the Beas without meeting any opposition. At Mālkot he was joined by Dilāwar Khan, whose conduct in always joining a foreigner against his own father, to say the least, is inexplicable.¹⁴⁷ Bābur's rapid march and Dilāwar's defection completely paralysed Daulat's plans. Even Ghāzi Khan fled to Delhi to join Ibrāhīm Lodī. Daulat Khan could do nothing except offer an abject submission to Bābur.¹⁴⁸

With Daulat Khan's submission and 'Ālam Khan's defeat by Ibrāhīm, Bābur had hardly any problems left in the Punjab. He had become its virtual master. As he advanced towards Delhi,¹⁴⁹ many nobles of the Delhi court including Mulla Muhammad Mazhab and Āraish Khan sent him letters promising their assistance. 'Ālam Khan, crest-fallen and destitute, also joined his camp. "Perhaps at this time also came proposals from Sangrām Singh the Rajput, that there should be a joint attack upon Ibrāhīm."¹⁵⁰

However, this was only one side of the picture. On the other side all the rulers of Hindustan, especially those of western India, were interested in the outcome of the impending battle between Bābur and Ibrāhīm. Rana Sāngā was sanguine about establishing Rajput supremacy after the battle whether the one lost or the other.

¹⁴³ T.A., II, 6; *Makhzan*, 82 (b).

¹⁴⁴ B.N. (B), II, 445; *Ferishta*, I, 203.

¹⁴⁵ B.N. (B), II, 447.

¹⁴⁶ T.S.A., 92 has ten thousand horse.

¹⁴⁷ Bābur later on conferred on him the title of Khan-i-Khānān. He continued to serve under Humayūn and died as a prisoner of Sher Shah. B.N. (B), II, 457; *Turuk-i-Jahāngīrī*, text, 42.

¹⁴⁸ B.N. (B), II, 458-59; *Ferishta*, I, 203-4.

¹⁴⁹ On the march Daulat Khan Lodī died at Sultaupur in January, 1526, B.N. (L and E), 299.

¹⁵⁰ R. Williams, *op. cit.*, 127.

Prince Bahādur Shāh of Gujarat with 3,000 horse — present as an onlooker, interested in the outcome¹⁵⁰ when the great battle took place, near Panipat. Mahmūd Khaljī of Malwa did not actually mobilise his forces for fear of Mewar and Gujarat, but the fact of the matter was that the kings of Mewar, Gujarat and Malwa had their own plans after the battle of Panipat was over. Besides, it was rightly reported to Bābur that Ibrāhīm Lodī had started with an army of a hundred thousand men to oppose his advance. Indeed, before Bābur arrived at Panipat his forces had had to encounter two advance contingents of the Delhi army, one under Dāūd Khan on 26 February and the other under Hātīm Khan on 2 April, 1526, both of which, however, he routed.¹⁵¹

Battle of Panipat

On April 12, 1526, Bābur arrived at Panipat, a small village north-west of Delhi where the fate of India has been thrice decided.¹⁵² His army did not by now perhaps exceed more than 8,000 effectives, the rest having been allocated garrison duties in the Punjab.¹⁵³ This army he so stationed on the open field that his right side was protected by the village of Panipat, and the left was shielded by digging a ditch and constructing a palisade of felled trees and thorny bushes. While this was a good protective device, it was also a veritable trap if Ibrāhīm tried to force his way through it. Thus the only vulnerable point left was the front and in that small space he concentrated his Centre supported by artillery,—guns and matchlocks. Bābur's wide experience of warfare had determined his strategy and he had decided to drive the enemy's forces into a huddled mass upon which Ustād 'Alī and Mustafā, his artillery commanders, could direct their cannonade. To produce such a situation, he collected all his baggage carts and some others from the countryside and these he fastened together by ropes of raw hide, arranging them in an extended line. This line was not continuous and at intervals large gaps were left for the deployment

¹⁵⁰ Abū Turāb, *History of Gujarat*, 3-4. C.H.I., III. 321-22.

¹⁵¹ B.N. (B) II, 467-68.

¹⁵² In 1526, 1556 and 1761.

¹⁵³ R. Williams, *op. cit.*, 127-28, 132, thinks that they were even less than 8,000. T.A., II, 14 has "approximately 15,000 horse and foot".

of his cavalry—for 150 to 200 horse to rush forth and manoeuvre—at an opportune moment. The musketeers and artillerymen were provided special shelter by small breastworks constructed in considerable numbers.¹⁵⁴

Ibrāhīm Lodī too marched out of Delhi and encamped two *kuroh* from Panipat. According to Ahmad Yādgār he held a grand Darbār on the eve of the battle, distributed all his jewellery and much of his treasure among his nobles, and exhorted them to give a good fight to the enemy promising them handsome rewards if success attended his side.¹⁵⁵ Then with a hundred thousand soldiers and one thousand elephants he arrived on the field of Panipat,¹⁵⁶ although his effectives were probably not more than fifty thousand.¹⁵⁷

The two armies lay facing each other for eight days, April 12 to 19, but neither side took the offensive. Feeling convinced that delay would imperil his whole plan, Bābur despatched an advance force on the 19th under Mahdī Khwājā to attack the enemy.¹⁵⁸ The surprise failed, but it helped provoke the adversary into launching an attack. On the morning of 21 April, 1526 (8 Rajjab, 932 H)¹⁵⁹ Ibrāhīm's army advanced to attack. On the opposite side the Turki-Mughal army was drawn up in the traditional formation of Right, Centre, Left and Van, but there were large flanking parties (*tūlughmā*) for each of the formations. The main Right wing was under the command of prince Humayūn, and the main Left was under Mahdī Khawājā. The Van was led by Khusrū Kukultash and Muhammad 'Alī Jang-Jang. Ustad 'Alī with the heavy pieces was posted ■ the right of the Centre, and Mustafā with lighter pieces ■ the left of it. Bābur, of course, was in the Centre.

For the first time Ibrāhīm Lodī was face to face with cavalry force supported by artillery. The Lodi monarch must have possessed some knowledge of Bābur's plan of forcing him to attack the Centre where enemy guns would have mowed him down. So

¹⁵⁴ B.N. (B), II, 468-71. ¹⁵⁵ T.S.A., 94-95.

¹⁵⁶ B.N. (B), II, 470; T.D., 134; *Ferishta*, I, 205; T.A., II, 14.

¹⁵⁷ T.S.A., 95 has 50,000 horse and 2,000 elephants.

¹⁵⁸ B.N. (B), II, 471.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 472; T.D., 134; T.S.A., 95; T.A., II, 15.

he avoided the Centre, pushed his Left Wing forward and "like the Hindus struck like lightning"¹⁴⁰ on Bābur's Right. But the Afghans pressed on, they found themselves attacking upon a front far shorter than had been anticipated and could not decide whether to attack or to retire, "to halt or not, advance or not". Meanwhile Bābur's flanking parties (*tulughmā*) wheeled round and encircled the Afghans.

The battle was now in full swing. The fire of Bābur's musketeers and artillery-men created more consternation than actual destruction,¹⁴¹ but the new weapons did not fail to inspire terror in the hearts of the Indian soldiers. Intermittent fire accompanied by the boom of guns and the rattle of matchlocks from the front, and the attack by arrow and sword the flanks and from the rear on the jammed mass of the Afghan army, which it had become soon after the battle had begun, decided the day. By noon those of the Afghan army who could extricate themselves were fleeing for life, while the field was strewn with thousands of dead. When the day seemed to be irrevocably lost, Mahmūd Khan suggested to Ibrāhīm to leave the field, but the spirited Afghan would not listen to such advice.¹⁴² He fought to the bitter end and died like a soldier.¹⁴³ Around his body lay five to six thousand of his bravest warriors. The little army of Bābur had slain nearly three times its own number—"a terrible testimony alike to the skill of the leader and

¹⁴⁰ Ferishta, I, 205.

¹⁴¹ R. Williams, 136 is not correct in saying: "Ustad 'Alī and Mustafa rained death upon the crowded ranks". After all Bābur's artillery was almost "primitive" judged by our standards. In the attack at Bajour in January, 1519, Bābur's matchlockmen had brought down seven to ten men only "before evening", but the people of the fort were alarmed that "for fear of the matchlocks, not one of them would venture to show head." B.N. (L & E), 247.

Similarly in the attack on Chandari in February, 1528 "Ustad 'Alī played his gun remarkably well. The first day it discharged it eight times; the second day sixteen times... Another gun, larger than this had been planted, but it burst at the first shot. The matchlockmen continued... shooting and they struck down a number of horses and men. Among others they killed (just) two of the royal slaves, and a number of their horses." B.N. (L & E, 379-80.

¹⁴² T.S.A., 96-7. Also B.N. (E), II, 474-75.

¹⁴³ T.S.A., 98; Ferishta, I, 205; T.A., II, 16; M.R., I, 498.

to the deadliness of his scientific combination of cavalry and artillery".¹⁵⁴

In the long roll of the Sultans of Delhi, Ibrāhīm Lodi was the only one who died fighting on the field of battle.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, about his bravery there can be no two opinions. In private life too his character was blameless. He was kindly disposed towards his subjects. Their welfare was ever in his mind. He took a keen interest in the promotion of agriculture. During his reign, crops were abundant, food grains were cheap¹⁵⁶ and the people in general lived happily in the midst of plenty. But his attitude towards his nobles was impolitic and rash. His attempt at absolutism and suppression of independent-minded barons, though perhaps justified, was premature. At least it proved to be unfortunate; the flower of his soldiery perished in the war against Islām Khan. At a time when external danger threatened him from the north-west, he had no supporters left either in the east or the west. However, it must be conceded that even if Ibrāhīm had not quarrelled with his nobles, Bābur would have won the battle of Panipat because, above everything else, Ibrāhīm's fall was due to the new weapons, new strategy and superior generalship of Bābur.

The battle of Panipat proved to be as decisive as it was sanguine.

¹⁵⁴ R. William, 137.

¹⁵⁵ *Makhzan*, 83 (b). Naturally many legends grew about his heroic death. An eye witness wrote a couplet in Hindi describing the event :

नीसी उपर होत बातिया - पानीपत में भारत दिया ।

सालु राजा आवत — बाबर जीता इब्राहिम हारा ।

(In 932 India was made over at Panipat.

On 7 Rajjab Bābur won, Ibrāhīm lost.)

The same has been reproduced by Ahmad Yādgār and 'Abdulla in Urdu. Yādgār only changes the date from 7 Rajjab to 4 Rajjab. T.D. has 7 intact.

'Abdulla on the authority of an eye-witness, 120 years old, that Ibrāhīm did not die on the field of battle. He wheeled round from there with a few followers for the Miyān-i-Doab. While he was crossing the river (Jumna) the witness "saw him" attired in royal robes and seated on a black Iraqi charger, but he did not come out of the water and was drowned at the ford of Birauna.

But Sir Henry Elliot rightly comments : "The old narrator may have witnessed the scene, but who will be the witness for the narrator". ■ and D, V, 30 n.

¹⁵⁶ Vide Chapter 12.

The Afghan hegemony was broken and the Sultanate of Delhi passed into the hands of the Chaghtai Turks better known as the Mughals. Without wasting any time Bābur despatched a force under Mahdī Khwājā to occupy Delhi and another under Humayūn to seize Agra. Six days after the battle Bābur's Khutba was read in the congregational mosque at Delhi.¹²⁷ When after Panipat he had first arrived in Agra, "there was a strong mutual dislike between my people and the men of the place", writes he. "The peasantry and soldiers of the country avoided and fled from my men."¹²⁸ That was but natural. Nay, the contemporaries of Daulat Khan Lodī would have even cursed him for the welcome he had extended to a foreigner to invade India. But — at a distance of more than four hundred years share in the welcome. The twilight of the Sultanate had ended with Ibrāhīm; the night of people's suspicion and fear was not long, and the Mughal rule ushered a new dawn in India which brightened as time advanced.

¹²⁷ B.N. (B), II, 476. The power of Rana Sangrām Singh was destroyed at the battle of Kanuab, March, 1527, and of the remnant Afghans at that of Ghagra, May, 1529.

¹²⁸ B.N. (L & E), 335; (B), II, 523.

Chapter II

CULTURAL ACTIVITY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

THE POLITICAL HISTORY of India from Timūr to Bābur does not make happy reading. During the first half of the period, despite its struggle for survival, the Sultanate went on shrinking. Some stability was attained in the second half, some lost territory was reclaimed, but then all was lost to Bābur in the end. In the political sphere, therefore, the fifteenth century — a period of decay and disintegration.

But in the social and cultural sphere this period of a century and a quarter was of sustained progress and great achievements. It saw the development of new patterns in architecture. Many works of merit were produced in classical as well as regional languages. Many reformers and poets gave a new tone to society by their teachings and writings. The fifteenth century was thus a century of cultural advancement, of new trends in social behaviour and, above all, an age of socio-religious reforms. We will now turn to review the social and cultural achievements of the period under study.

Architecture

In its heyday the Lodi empire extended from the Indus in the west to the bend of the Ganga in Bihar in the east. In the north it went up to the sub-montane belt of the Himalayās and in the south its boundary — along a zigzag west-to-east line including Nagor, Mandrael, Narwar, Chanderi, Chunār and Khalgaon. Even when the empire was not so extensive, or conditions so favourable, the Saiyyad and Lodi Sultans, following the traditions of old, gave attention to art and letters, and constructional work went on throughout the one and a quarter century of their rule.

The Khaljis and the Tughlaqs were mighty builders. They had built enthusiastically, repaired and conserved old buildings, and developed a robust style of their own. But the continuity of

architectural exuberance of the Tughlaq times received a setback at the hands of Timūr. Timūr's invasion swept everything before it. Besides the treasure of the State and the wealth of the capital, he carried away with him many good craftsmen, architects and stone-workers to Samarqand to build for him there, while many others, following the confusion of his attack, migrated to various provincial capitals. Without money and without artisans it was not possible for the rulers of Delhi to accomplish much. During the first decade after Timūr's departure, perhaps only one building was constructed, an Idgāh by Mallū Iqbāl Khan, in an inscription on which he heartily cursed the "Kāfir" conqueror. The first two Saiyyads restored some political stability. Khizr Khan and Mubārak Shāh even founded two cities, but they (Khizrābād and Mubārakābād) have practically disappeared because of their poor construction owing to limited financial resources.

The buildings constructed during the Saiyyad and the Lodī regime fall into two groups, (a) tombs and (b) mosques. The tomb-construction began to take a definite shape. It was based on two different conventions, one octagonal in plan and the other square. The prototypes of the first pattern are the three royal tombs of Mubārak Shāh Saiyyad (died 1434), Muhammad Saiyyad (d. 1445) and Sikandar Lodī (d. 1517). They deserve a detailed study for they reveal the stages in the evolution of the octagonal process which had begun in the tomb of Khan-i-Jahān Telangānī, the Prime Minister of Firōz Shāh, constructed in 1368-69¹, and found its culmination in the magnificent mausoleum of Sher Shāh Sūr. This type remained popular for well-nigh two centuries, and even provided the inspiration for some of Akbar's monuments.

The tomb of Mubārak Shāh Saiyyad² is 30 feet each octagonal side, 74 feet wide, and the height of the dome, excluding the finial, is 50 feet. Here, the central dome is raised higher than in the original prototype, the Telangānī tomb. The height of the verandah, too, is increased; pinnacles (*guldastās*) are provided at the angles of the polygonal drum; kiosks (*Chhatris*) replace subsidiary domes, and an arched lantern crowns the summit in place of the usual

¹ Percy Brown, *Indian Architecture* (Islamic Period), Additional Plates, P.C. III, fig. 1.

² Arch. Sur. Ind. Rep., IV, 65.

finial.³ But there is one defect also. In the upper part the structure rises above the spectator's eyes and from the average line of sight these parts are foreshortened. The result is a slightly stunted elevation.

This defect is removed in the tomb of Saiyyad Muhammad, erected some ten years later by his son and successor 'Alīuddīn 'Ālam Shāh.⁴ This tomb, which lies in Khairpur to the north-east of the tomb of Safdar Jung, has the same dimensions as those of Mubārak Shāh, but the height of the central dome as well as the kiosks is elegantly elevated. Besides, there is also symmetry and cohesion in its several parts. Many of its features—use of local grey-stone and pierced stone-screens—were inherited from preceding centuries, but some — ones, chiefly decorative in character, were added to them. These include the — of blue enamelled tiling, refined treatment of surface ornament incised on plaster and embellished with colours, and the lotus finials on the domes, etc. The inner walls are decorated with quotations from the Quran in incised plaster. Besides Muhammed Saiyyad's, there are seven more graves, obviously of other relatives.

The tombs of Saiyyad Mubārak and Saiyyad Muhammad are now more or less isolated structures, any supplementary features that may have surrounded them having disappeared. On the other hand the tomb of Sikandar Lodī,⁵ constructed by his son and successor Ibrāhīm in 1518, is better preserved and is more finished in form. It is similar in design and dimensions to that of Muhammad Shāh, but in this mausoleum the use of enamelled tiles has been much extended; tiles of several colours—green, yellow, azure and dark blue—are disposed in a variety of patterns. There is a marked tendency towards more lavish ornamentation. A significant struc-

³ Sir John Marshall, C.H.I., III, 594.

⁴ Arch. Sur. Rep., XX, 158; Carr Stephen, *Archaeology and Monumental Remains of Delhi*, 161-2; *Chronicles*, 336; *Āsar*, Chapter, III, 42; J.A.S.B., XXXIX, 82; List., III, 32-33.

⁵ In Arch. Sur. Rep., IV, 184-85, A. L. Carlisle located Sikandar's tomb at Agra near Sikandara. But Sir Saiyyad Ahmad Khan identifies it with the fine building in a walled enclosure at Khairpur, old Delhi. *Āsar*, I, 89.

Ni'amatullah's positive statement about Sikandar Lodī being buried in a garden by the side of his father's tomb sets at rest the doubts about the location of the tomb. *Makhsan*, 65 (a).

tural deviation is also noticeable. In the tombs of the two preceding monarchs the dome is solely of uniform thickness of stonework, but in the present instance the dome is composed of an inner and outer shell of masonry, with a distinct space between the two. Such a device was quite well known in Iraq, Persia, and other parts of western Asia, but in India, Sikandar's tomb provides the first "successful" example in the application of the "double dome".⁶ It imparted a loftier and more imposing exterior, and provided the interior with larger space. Since later on, the larger domes of India were constructed on this same principle, the emergence of the device in the Lodī period is of special significance.⁷ Another noteworthy feature of Sikandar Lodī's mausoleum was its walled enclosure "which occupies a place midway between the fortified enclaves of the Tughlaq tombs and the decorative garden of the Mughals".⁸

The octagonal method of tomb-construction seems to have been confined to the royal family. The square-plan type of tomb was, perhaps, reserved for nobles and others of high rank, although some of them are even larger and more imposing than the royal tombs. The square type curiously enough found favour during the Saiyyad and Lodī time only, and all its examples fall within the fifteenth century. In Delhi and its neighbourhood there are at least seven such mausoleums. They are now known by their local names only, and it is difficult to say whose memory they commemorate. They are Barē Khan Ka Gumbad (or Dome), Chhotē Khan Ka Gumbad, Bara Gumbad, Shish Gumbad, Tomb of Shihābuddīn Tāj Khan, Dādī Ka Gumbad and Polī Ka Gumbad.⁹ They are square solid buildings with domes carried on squinch arches and an octagonal pillared kiosk (light open *chhatrī*) at each corner of the roof.

Bara Gumbad, so called because of its lofty dome 80 feet to the top, lies some 300 yards north-east of the tomb of Muhammad Shāh

⁶ Percy Brown, 27-28; Marshall, *op. cit.* 595.

⁷ Arch. Sur. Ind. Report, IV, 69; Carr Stephen, 170-71; Āsār., Chapter, III, 46; Hearn, *Seven Cities of Delhi*, 130; Rodgers, 89-90; J.A.S.B., XXIX, 1870, 84; Cole, *Reports of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India*, 3 Reports, Second Report, 1882-83, Government Press, Calcutta, C XI; *Ist.*, III, 38-41.

⁸ Marshall, 595 n.

⁹ Percy Brown, 28.

Saiyyad. An inscription over the southern Mihrāb, incised in plaster, points to its construction in 1494 (900 H). It is a beautiful structure as its domes rest on corbelled pendentives most elaborately carved and finished. At the north and south ends of the apartment are oriel or projecting windows, whose prototype may be found in the back wall of the Quwwat-ul-Islam mosque at the Qutb. The Bara Gumbad has a mosque attached to it which is profusely decorated throughout with conventional foliage and verses from the Quran in incised plaster relieved by coloured tile-work.

Cunningham compares the eastern gateway of the Bara Gumbad with the famous 'Alāi Darwāzā constructed by 'Alāuddin Khalji, and his opinion is shared by Fergusson.¹⁰ In contrast to the rich internal treatment of the 'Alāi Darwāzā¹¹ the walls of the Bara Gumbad are left uncarved. But in its grandeur it is perhaps unequalled in the ruins of Delhi — by its prototype,¹² although it is far removed "from that ideal structure".¹³ Shish Gumbad, or the Glazed Dome, is situated some 50 yards to the north of the Bara Gumbad. The tomb of an unidentified dignitary, its ceiling is decorated with floral carvings in incised plaster and quotations from the Quran. The exterior is ornamented with the blue glazed tiles in two shades which must have lent it a very striking appearance and which give the tomb its name.¹⁴

It would be needless to make a detailed study of all the "Gumbads" mentioned above and many more like the Hijr Ka Gumbad (Dome of Hermaphrodite) and Nili Gumbad, so called because of its blue tiles. The treatment in all cases is almost the same. A single chamber comprises the interior which is square in plan and the dome is supported by a squinch arch at each corner. There are sunken archways, those on the west contain the *mihrāb*. This gives a feeling of monotony and these structures seen one after the other look rather stereotyped.

In the sphere of mosque construction the Saiyyads could not

¹⁰ Arch. Sur. Ind. Rep., IV, 67 ff; XX, 155-57; Fergusson, II, 210.

¹¹ K. S. Lal, *History of the Khalifs*, 377-79.

¹² Carr Stephen, 196-97; Asar., III, 52; J.A.S.B., XXIX, 1870, 70-88.

¹³ Percy Brown, 29.

¹⁴ Arch. Sur. Rep., XX, 158; List., III, 36-37.

boast of any large ones of the public ■ congregational order;¹⁶ but with the accession of Sikandar Lodī, a new leaf is turned in this field. A devout Musalman, he is said to have built mosques throughout his kingdom.¹⁷ But most of them were of a private nature, mostly attached to the tombs. However, there ■ some notable structures like the mosque attached to the Bara Gumbad and Moth Ki Masjid, which in their specialised form of design provide ■ motif for Jamala Masjid (constructed in 1536) and Qila Kuhnā Masjid of Sher Shāh (built in C 1550) in the last of which they ultimately reach perfection.

The mosque attached to the Bara Gumbad is a kind of domestic chapel, and represents the Lodī technique in embryo.¹⁷ This technique is definitely improved in the Moth Ki Masjid, built ten years later (1505) by Miān Bhuā, the Prime Minister of Sikandar Lodī.¹⁸ Moth Ki Masjid stands on ■ raised platform. The gateway is faced with red sandstone ornamented with marble. The eastern angles of the enclosure are marked by domed *chhatris* supported ■ eight red stone pillars and contain traces of blue tile decoration.

This mosque¹⁹ is much larger than the one attached to the Bara Gumbad, and measures nearly one hundred and twenty-five feet across. Consequently it provided much more scope for the skill of the craftsmen and "it epitomises in itself all that is best in the architecture of the Lodīs".²⁰ In the central portion the system of squinch arches found in earlier buildings continues, but in the side aisles ■ form of stalactite pendentive is introduced in the

¹⁶ There is one of Mubārak Shāh ■ Badaon, of no great architectural significance. Arch. Sur. Rep. XVI, 26; J.A.S.B., 1872, 111-12, Epi. Indo-Moslemica, III, 1909-10.

¹⁷ T.A., I, 336; *Makhzan*, 76 (a).

■ Percy Brown, 29.

¹⁸ There is a story behind the construction of this mosque. Once ■ Emperor gave a grain of *moth* to his Prime Minister Miān Bhuā. The latter, thinking ■ grain to be auspicious, it having touched the royal palm, sowed it into ■ ground and obtained a few more grains. The process was repeated and ■ crop obtained. The crop was sowed as seed and a huge harvest was collected. In ■ of time, from the income of that one *moth*, the mosque ■ built up. This ■ how it came to be known as Moth Ki Masjid. *Khulāsat-ul-Tawārīkh*, 278.

¹⁹ Arch. Sur. Rep., IV, 67, 90. *Archæology*, 1902-3, 77; Carr Stephen, 166-67; Anār., Chapter, III, 44; Rodgers, 89.

■ Sir John Marshall in C.H.I., III, 596.

angles.²¹ Free intermixture of white marble, red sandstone and enamelled tiles lends a colourful effect to the decoration, which contrasts effectively with the bold quality of the masonry. The spandrels above the arches are full of carvings in plaster with exquisite arabesque designs of typically Islamic character. Percy Brown suggests: "There was evidently a very talented group of craftsmen, engaged in this art during the fifteenth century, reminiscent of that much greater school of artists who, at about the same time were perpetuating such wonders in a similar technique on the walls of the Alhambra in Spain."²²

Sikandar Lodī was by far the greatest builder of the fifteenth century. Inscriptions on various buildings in northern India indicate his love for architectural activity. He is credited with constructing a canal in A.D. 1492-93²³ ■ Baoli in Rajputana²⁴ and mosques in almost all important cities including Lahore, Karnal, Hansi and Mākanpur (district Kanpur), besides many in Delhi and Agra.²⁵ There are also so many nameless mosques and tombs belonging to the Lodī period which, from their design and material of construction, can safely be attributed to Sikandar's time.²⁶ Like Firōz Tughlaq, Sikandar Lodī was not only a great builder but also a great repairer. In his time in A.D. 1492 (897 H) was built the mausoleum of Amīr Khusrū. An inscribed frieze at the entrance doorway of the Qutb Mīnār credits him with repairing this world famous edifice in A.D. 1503 (909 H),²⁷ although the nature of the repairs is not known. A few more buildings of his son and successor Ibrāhīm Lodī ■ also extant, ■ the tomb of Khwājā Khizr (completed in 1522) and Rajōn Kī Baoli, with a mosque attached to it. But Ibrāhīm's political difficulties left him little time for much constructional activity.

Besides the Imperial style of architecture, two other local styles,

²¹ Percy Brown, 29-30.

²² Percy Brown, 30. Cf. Also Sir John Marshall, *op. cit.*, 596-97.

²³ P.A.S.B., 1872, 48. ²⁴ Arch. Sur. Rep., XX, 131.

²⁵ Arch. Sur. Rep., XVII, 105.

Ibid., XXIII, 115; P.A.S.B., 1873, 141. Epi. Indica, II, 1894, 137. Rodgers, *Revised List of Objects of Archaeological Interest in the Punjab*, 50, 151.

■ List, II, Delhi Province, Monuments Nos. 101, 104, 107 and many others.

²⁷ Epi. Ind., 1919-20, 4; Carr Stephen, 59-60. Asār, III, 18. Asiatic Researches, XIV, 487. J. A. Page, *A Guide to the Qutb*, Delhi, 21.

those of Jaunpur and Gwalior, deserve special attention.

Otherwise ■■ obscure place, Jaunpur was brought into prominence in 1360 by Firōz Shāh Tughlaq, who built it into a city. It assumed independence a little before Timūr's invasion and thereafter continued its own course undisturbed. Even when it was engaged in wars against Delhi and other neighbouring kingdoms, its rulers continued to lend patronage to art and learning. The buildings that the Sharqīs of Jaunpur have left speak of their aesthetic architectural taste. Unfortunately many of Jaunpur's finest monuments were destroyed by Sikandar Lodī after defeating Husain Shāh in 1495. The few that have survived include several large mosques, three of which still remain tolerably entire, and a considerable number of tombs and palaces. The Atālā mosque, the Khālīs Mūkhlīs, the Lāl Darwāzā Masjid, the Jhanjhri mosque and the Jama' Masjid are some of the best specimens of Indo-Muslim architecture in India.

The construction of the Atālā mosque was started in about 1373 during the reign of Firōz Shāh Tughlaq and was completed in about 1408 in the reign of Ibrāhīm Sharqī (1401-1440). It was erected on the site and from the material of an earlier Hindu temple said to have been built by Raja Vijāya Chandra Dēva of Varanasi.²⁹ Built on the orthodox plan, it consists of ■■ square courtyard, measuring 177 feet on each side, with the prayer chamber ■■ the west and colonnaded cloisters on the other sides. The domes over the prayer chamber and its back wall, the tapering minarets, the *hangūra* cornices and the arches and trellis windows are of the Tughlaq style. On the other hand the imposing propylon (75 feet high), propylon screens and surface decoration give it, and the Jaunpur style, its distinctive character. The Atālā mosque is so like ■■ Hindu arrangement "that one might almost ■■ first sight be tempted . . . to fancy it was originally a Hindu monastery",³⁰ but it also exhibits the saracenic arcuate style in as great ■■ degree of perfection as is exhibited at any period, prior or subsequent. The one defect pointed out in this edifice is that the propylon was made so lofty that the domes are hidden from view, but the architects

²⁹ Fuhrer and Smith, *Sharqī Architecture of Jaunpur*, Arch. Sur. of India, 1889, plates, 29-40.

³⁰ Fergusson, II, 227.

seem to have so designed the building that while the massive propylon looks grand and imposing from the front, the domes seen from the sides and the rear are equally beautiful.

Another mosque belonging to the reign of Ibrāhīm Sharqī built by two governors of Jaunpur, Malik Khālīs and Mukhlīs, who have given their names to it. The Jhanjhri Masjid was also built by Ibrāhīm in honour of Hazrat Sa'īd Sadr Jahān Ajmalī.²⁰ The former is a plain structure, but the latter, though badly mutilated, was very similar in design to the Atālā mosque as is indicated by its propylon screens. The Lāl Darwāzā Masjid, so called because of its vermilion-painted gate, was built by Mahmūd Shāh (1440-52) and the Jama' Masjid by Husain Shāh (1452-78). Both these are more or less based on the design of the Atālā Masjid, although the latter edifice is more imposing than the former. The architect of the Lāl Darwāzā mosque is said to have been a Hindu, named Kamaū, the son of Visadru, and it is likely that the architect of the Atālā Masjid was also a Hindu.²¹ Thus the architecture of Jaunpur had all the beauty and grace of the Hindu art employed to the best advantage in the construction of their mosques.²² The massive propylon gives the facade almost the look of a south Indian temple, and constitutes the most distinctive element of the style. The peculiarities of this style—the best blending of the Hindu and the Muslim—extended into other important cities of Jaunpur kingdom like Kalpi, Varanasi, Ghāzipur and Azamgarh.

The architecture of Gwalior, annexed to the Sultanate in 1518, can be best described in one word—grandiose. Perched on a high hill, the fort and palace of Raja Mān Singh (1486-1518) and the palace added by his successor Vikramāditya, are the most remarkable examples of the Hindu architecture of northern India during the period under review. Bābur was struck by their beauty and wrote: "They are singularly beautiful palaces (of Mān Singh and his successor Vikramāditya), wholly of hewn stone. The palace of Mān Singh is more lofty and splendid than that of any other Rajas The five large domes are covered with plates of copper gilt. The outside of the walls they have inlaid with green painted

²⁰ Marshall, *op. cit.*, 627.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 628.

²² Cunningham, Arch. Sur. Rep., I, 287; Fergusson, II, 227-8.

tiles."³³ The copper is gone, but the tiles still look exquisite. A visitor to Gwalior is even today struck by its grandeur, and Fergusson rightly remarks that these palaces furnished points of imitation to Mughal emperors as well as Hindu princes.³⁴

The Imperial or Delhi, Jaunpur and Gwalior styles are the chief styles of the Sultanate. The buildings in the Punjab have undergone such large-scale renovations in successive ages that the forms in which they now exist cannot be called pre-Mughal. In Sindh nothing of note was constructed during this period. But the rise of Bengal, Malwa, Gujarat, Bahmani and Vijayanagar as independent kingdoms gave fresh impetus to architectural activity. The capitals and other cities of these independent States were decorated by their monarchs according to the best of their ability and resources. Thus the break up of the Sultanate at the close of the fourteenth century did not prove to be an unmitigated curse, for throughout the fifteenth century different schools of architecture flourished in these various States; and although their study does not fall within the frame-work of this work, a brief survey of their accomplishments would be good for a comparative study, and for having a glimpse into the overall picture of the architectural achievements of the country as a whole.

In Bengal, the early Muslim buildings bear traces of the Hindu temple architecture since they are mostly superstructures on the original Hindu, but the climate of Bengal is singularly inimical to the preservation of architectural remains, that the extant ones belong only to the period of over two centuries (A. D. 1338-1576). Besides, Bengal is practically without stone. Therefore, the Muslim rulers constructed their edifices with heavy short pillars of stone supporting pointed arches and vaults of brick, and the style so developed may rightly be called the "brick style" of Bengal. The Purbiya dynasty of Bengal (A. D. 1352-1487) did not do anything much to entitle them to a place in political history, but since they possessed one of the richest regions of India, they spent their wealth lavishly in adorning their capital with beautiful buildings. Jalāluddīn Muhammad Shāh (1414-1443) was a great builder. His Eklakhi mosque is a bold architectural enterprise and though

³³ B.N. (B), II, 608-9. Bābur visited it on 27 September, 1528.

³⁴ Fergusson, II, 176.

smaller than the Ādina mosque (built by Sikandar Shāh, 1358-89), it is a great improvement upon it. A very interesting antiquity of Bengal is the Minār standing just outside the fort of Gaur. For two-thirds of the height it is a polygon of twelve sides; above that it is circular till it attains the height of 84 feet. There is said to have been an inscription ascribing its erection to Saifuddin Firōz Shāh II (A. D. 1488-90). There are also several gateways, the finest one being the Dākhlī or Salāmi gateway, the northern entrance to Gaur fort, said to have been built by Ruknuddin Bārbak Shāh (1460-74). It is made of brick, but in strength and grace it is second to none in its class found anywhere.

To the west of the shrunken Sultanate of Delhi had risen two powerful kingdoms, Malwa and Gujarat. The Ghorīs of Malwa declared independence about the same time as the Sharqīs of Jaunpur. The Ghorī dynasty of Malwa made Māndū their capital. It occupies one of the noblest sites occupied by any capital in India.³⁶ It is an extensive plateau four or five miles east and west and three miles north and south, abounding in water and fertile in the highest degree. This Māndū, the Ghorī and Khaljī dynasties adorned with all kinds of beautiful buildings.

The finest building in Māndū is the Jama' Masjid, commenced by Hoshang Shāh and completed by Mahmūd Khaljī I in 1454. "Though not very large, it is so simple and grand . . . that it ranks high among the monuments of its class."³⁷ The tomb of its founder stands behind the mosque. Its stern style is relieved by three perforated marble screens of exquisite beauty. More beautiful than all these—mosques and tombs—are the palaces of Māndū. The massive and picturesque "Jahāz Mahal" is situated between two great tanks, almost literally in the water, like a ship. The other palaces of note are the palace of Bāz Bahādur (built apparently by Nāsiruddin Khaljī in 1509),³⁸ the pavilion of Rūpmati and the Hindōlā Mahal built much later.

The Māndū architecture in a word is massive, elegant and saracenic. Red sandstone and marble, both white and coloured and locally available, have been freely used, the first for constructive and the other for decorative purposes. The builders clung steadily to the pointed-arch style and unlike Jaunpur and Gujarat,

³⁶ Fergusson, II, 247.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 248.

³⁸ Fergusson, II, 250.

the Hindu principles do not seem to have influenced the style of Māndū.³⁸

About the architecture of Gujarat, Fergusson remarks: "Of the various forms which the saracenic architecture assumed in India, that of Ahmadabad may probably be considered as the most elegant, as it certainly is the most characteristic of all. No other form is essentially Indian."³⁹ For long Gujarat had been a bulwark of Jainism and it contained a considerable number of big and beautiful Jain and Hindu temples. Even after its conquest by 'Alāuddīn Khaljī in A. D. 1299, the Chalukyan style of architecture continued to persist. When Muzaffar Shāh, a converted Rajput of the Tank clan,⁴⁰ and the governor of Gujarat, declared his independence there was, as it were, conversion of Rajput government into Muslim, of Rajput architecture into Muslim. In A. D. 1411 his grandson Ahmad Shāh, moved his capital to Karnavati, which was then renamed Ahmadabad,⁴¹ and he and his successors decorated Ahmadabad and other towns for the next two centuries.

Ahmad Shāh decorated his capital with all kinds of elegant buildings—fort, mosques, gates and tombs. From the fort to the gateway known as the Tīn Darwāzā and thence to the Jama' Masjid it is an achievement in town-planning. The Jama' Masjid of Ahmadabad was completed in A. D. 1423 and is "generally considered the high water-mark of mosque design in western India, if not in the entire country".⁴² Its spacious courtyard of 49,500 square feet and some 300 tall, slender, closely set pillars simulate "a thick grove of silver pine trunks".⁴³ It was but fitting that his son and successor Muhammad Shāh (1442-51) interred Ahmad Shāh in front of the eastern entrance to the Jama' Masjid and sustained his style in his tomb.

In Muhammad Shāh's reign the tomb of Shaikh Ahmad Khattari was built in 1446 at Sarkhej (6 miles S. W. of Ahmadabad). Many

³⁸ J.B.B.R.A.S., 1903, 339-40 gives a detailed study of the buildings of Dhar and Mandu.

³⁹ Fergusson, II, 229.

⁴⁰ For Tank or Tak clan see Elliot, *Races of the N.W. Province*, Beames's Edition, I, 109, 114; Cunningham, *Arch. Sur. Rep.*, II, 8; Tod, *Rajasthan*, Madras edition, I, 103 ff.

⁴¹ Havell, *Aryen Rule in India*, 341.

⁴² Percy Brown, 51.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 52 and plate XXXV, Fig. 2.

other mausoleums and mosques were built there by him and by his two successors Qutbuddin (1451-58) and Mahmūd I Beghara (A. D. 1459-1511). During the time of the latter came Gujarat's greatest days. He founded Mahmūdābād (17 miles S. E. of Ahmadabad) and decorated it, at the same time enhancing the beauty of Ahmadabad and other cities of Gujarat like Batwa and Champanir. The tomb of Shaikh Mubārak Saiyyad, erected about 1484 near Mahmūdābād, represents the arcuate style of Gujarat in its finished form. This tomb clearly betrays the style of Lodi tombs at Delhi and it is not improbable that some Delhi craftsmen were attracted to Gujarat. In 1492 the mosque of Muhāfiz Khan, "a gem of architectural refinement" was built. But the most famous mosque is that of Sidi Saiyyad built sometime between 1510 and 1515. Although almost an insignificant building, it has acquired world-wide fame because of the perforated stone screens in its sanctuary. Great skill is shown in the even manner in which the pattern is spread over the whole surface.⁴⁴ What the Gujaratis had been able to accomplish on hard stone in the fifteenth century, the Mughals could do on marble only in the seventeenth and perhaps not so well.

Of sanctuaries and mosques there is no dearth in Ahmadabad, Champanir and other prominent towns of Gujarat. Structures of the secular variety are also by no means inferior to the religious buildings. Among these is the palatial scheme at Sarkhej, consisting of a large artificial lake with Mahmūd Beghara's palaces occupying two of its sides. The step-wells of Gujarat are known for their artistic beauty. Two of these are the Bai Harir's in Ahmadabad constructed in 1499 and that at Adalaj built about the same time. Indeed in beauty and in construction the architecture of Gujarat was far superior to the contemporaneous architecture of the Sultanate of Delhi and for the matter of that to that of any other State in the country.

Like any other Muhammadan dynasty, the Bahmanis too were great builders. Their architecture betrays Sarcenic influence. The mosques at Gulbarga and Bidar are beautiful specimens of

⁴⁴ Burgess, *Muhammadan Architecture of Ahmadabad*, 41 ff and plates 46-51; Arch. Sur. of Western India, VII, 1901. Fergusson, II, 236-7 and plate 394; P. Brown, 38, and plate XLI, Fig. 1.

Deccan art, but the most remarkable architecture is that of Bijāpur. The Gol Gumbād (tomb of Muhammad 'Adil Shāh) has traces of Ottoman influence and so have ■■■ of the other tombs and mausoleums. The kings of Bijāpur ■■■ mighty builders. Their city-walls, colleges and libraries, though ravaged by time, still speak of their artistic tastes and accomplishments.⁴⁵

Equally impressive is the architecture of Vijāyanagar and Rajputana. The kings of Vijāyanagar built palaces, temples, public offices, aqueducts and irrigation works with great enthusiasm. And what they built, they decorated. Nuniz speaks of their "wonderful" system of irrigation, and Portuguese chroniclers and Abdur Razzāq speak highly of the beauty of Vijāyanagar painting and sculpture. Most of the buildings of this great kingdom are now in ruins, and yet they exhibit ■ grandeur which forces itself upon one's eyes. The famous Hazāra temple built during the reign of Krishna Deva Raya is "one of the most perfect specimens of Hindu temple architecture in existence".⁴⁶ Vitthalswāmī temple too "shows the extreme limit in florid magnificence to which the (South Indian) style advanced".⁴⁷

In Rajasthan, the palace of Rana Kumbha (A. ■. 1418-68) in Mewar is "grandiose", and shows the same "beauty of detail which characterises his buildings in general".⁴⁸ Its ruins show kiosks covered with domes resting on lintels and columns, amidst Hindu balconies.⁴⁹

Reverting to the imperial style of the Delhi Sultanate, it may be remarked that the Saiyyads and the Lodīs built little, but whatever they built they decorated well. Many of the constructional and decorative details of the fifteenth century were inherited from the preceding centuries, yet there are some innovations introduced. The use of blue enamelled tilings for decoration, surface ornamentation of incised plaster embellished with colours, lotus finials on domes, stunted turrets, *guldastās*, diminutive kiosks or *chhairs*, fuller domes and pinnacles are contributions of the Lodīs to Indo-

⁴⁵ Ferishta, II, 302.

⁴⁶ Longhurst, *Hampi Ruins*, Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of India, 124-32.

⁴⁷ Fergusson, I, 401.

⁴⁸ Fergusson, II, 172.

⁴⁹ Roussellet, *L'Inde des Rajās*, 232-33, cited in Fergusson, II, 172 and Tara Chand, 246.

Muslim architecture.⁵⁰ The double dome was adopted by the Mughals, ■ also the octagonal mausoleum. Sikandar Lodi's tomb enclosure anticipates the ornamental garden tombs of the Mughals. The use of enamelled tiles continued to be popular in future years. All this was no mean contribution of the fifteenth century to Indo-Islamic architecture. In the words of Sir John Marshall: "Out of the universal chaos which followed ■ the invasion of Timūr, there emerged ■ vigorous and catholic spirit of design—a spirit replete with creative energy and imagination—which under the Saiyyad and Lodi dynasties gave encouragement once more to the latent genius of Hindustan and at the same time derived new inspiration from the never failing source of Islamic art in Persia."⁵¹

Music and Painting

About the art of painting during this period little is known. The Sultans of pre-Mughal India ■■ great builders, but they do not seem to have had much liking for paintings. The Hadīs forbids painting of all human forms, and thus places ■ ban on the development of this art.⁵² Moreover, paintings either on paper or in plaster ■ not as durable as sculptures in stone, and when most of even the stone edifices of these times have been reduced to a dilapidated state, it is fruitless to search for any contemporary paintings. Even so we cannot say that the art of painting had ceased to exist. Ibn Battūta appreciated the "strikingly beautiful paintings and mosaic" of the palace of Hazār Sītūn.⁵³ We also know that Fīrōz Tughlaq forbade paintings on buildings, which shows that they were a common feature. But not much ■■ said about this art in this period.

Like architecture and painting, dance and music have also been the soul of India through the ages. The sculptures on the surviving temples have kept alive the glorious memory of dancing in ancient times. Commoners and kings held these fine arts in the highest esteem.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Fergusson, II, 176. Also B.N.(E), II, 603-14.

⁵¹ C.H.I., III, 593.

⁵² Islamic Culture, XXIV, 1950, 218-225.

⁵³ I.B., 58-59.

⁵⁴ The Hindu system of notation is perhaps the oldest; it was carried to Europe in the eleventh century A.D. G. S. Ojha, *Madhya Kālīn Bhārathya Sanskriti*, 193-4.

With the advent of Islam, the art of music and dancing entered upon a new phase. Music is prohibited in Islam, but human nature ever asserted itself against the austere laws of the faith. Muslim rulers and nobles always patronised music throughout the medieval times. Contact with Iran, rise of Sūfism and their stay in Hindustan made Muslim rulers lovers of music and dance. Indian classical music survived throughout the Sultanate period, although classical Indian dancing almost died out in northern India because it had drifted from the aesthetic sphere into that of the courtesans and the dancing girls.

The Khaljis were great patrons of music.⁵⁶ Amīr Khusru, himself a renowned musician, gives interesting details about contemporary musicians and musical instruments in his *A'ijār-i-Khusravī*.⁵⁷ Though a puritan, Fīrōz Tughlaq got a number of books on music and dance, he had obtained from the Jwālā Mukhī temple, translated into Persian.⁵⁸ Even the terrible Tīmūr, who had learnt about the beauty of Hindustani music, listened to Indian artistes when he was in this country and profusely rewarded them.⁵⁹

But the upheaval caused by Tīmūr's invasion dispersed the musicians of Delhi to the far-off courts of Gwalior, Jaunpur and Gujarat which remained centres of musical art throughout the fifteenth century. Husain Sharqī of Jaunpur was a great lover of music and he is said to have invented the Khayāl. Another great centre of music in northern India was Gwalior. Raja Mān Singh and his queen are said to have been proficient composers and singers. It is said that the Raja called a conference of musicians to make a proper classification of Rāgas.⁶⁰ Undoubtedly he was the founder of the Gwalior school of classical music.⁶¹ He is said to have revived the Dhrupad style which had been neglected and therefore forgotten

⁵⁶ T.F.S. (B), 128-29, 128, 199-200; Ferishta, I, 84; Aliyengar, *South India and Her Muhammedan Invaders*, 113-16.

⁵⁷ *A'ijār-i-Khusravī*, Bk. II, []

⁵⁸ Badami, I, 249.

⁵⁹ Abdul Ghanī, *op. cit.*, I, 31.

⁶⁰ His great-grandfather Dunga Singh, [] maintained friendly relations with rulers of other countries, sent a valuable work on music to Sultan Zainul Ābidin of Kashmir. Mohibbul Hasan, *op. cit.*, 73.

⁶¹ V. N. Bhatkhande, *A Short Historical Survey of the Music of Upper India*, 18.

since the days of Amīr Khusru.⁶¹ He was the author of a treatise on music entitled *Mām-Kutubhal*.⁶² He also got the *Rāgadarpana*, a treatise on Indian classical music, translated into Persian. In his court flourished masters like Baijū, Pandvi, Lohang. The master musician was Nāyak Bhikshū. It is, therefore, not surprising that Tansen originally belonged to Gwalior. In the far-off Vijāyanagar empire the art of music developed rapidly. Both Krishna Dēva Raya and the Regent, Rāma Raya, were proficient musicians, and during this period ■■■ new treatises on music were produced, about which we shall study a little later.

At Delhi music gradually regained its position with the stability of the Sultanate. The Saiyyad kings do not seem to have neglected this art and Mubārak Shāh was known for his love of music.⁶³ The orthodox Sikandar Lodi also was a great lover of music. Although to keep up ■ show of religious austerity he would not allow anyone to sing or play in his presence, all the celebrated artists used to come and perform before the King's favourite noblemen like Mīrān Saiyyad Rūhullā and Saiyyad Ibn Rasūl, whose tents, by the Sultan's orders, were pitched near those of the king's.⁶⁴ Thus the clever and virtuous monarch filled his ears with melody without damaging his reputation for piety. In the palace, instruments were regularly played on. Shahnāi was played every night, commencing at 9 o'clock.⁶⁵ A number of beautiful singers and players played ■ instruments like Chang, Qanūn, Tambūr and Vīnā.⁶⁶ According to 'Abdulla, the Sultan's favourite tunes were Mālkaus, Kalyān, Kanada and Husainī;⁶⁷ according to Ahnād Yādgār they were Kedār, Adāna, Husainī and Rāmkañ, while according to Rizqulla Mushtaḡī, his favourites were Gaur, Kalyān, Kanada and Maḡām-i-Husainī.⁶⁸ This list shows that Sikandar loved to listen to almost every important Rāga. Sikandar Lodi's services in promoting the

⁶¹ Islamic Culture, XXIX, 1955, 20.

⁶² Blochmann, *Ann.* I, 581; Haribar Nivas Dwivedi, *Mām Singh aur Mām-Kutubhal* (Hindi) 41, 43.

⁶³ T.M.S., 211. ⁶⁴ T.D., 40.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 41. گلشن يك هر از شب: E.D., IV, 449.

⁶⁶ T.S.A., 48.

⁶⁷ T.D., 41. In Persian music there are, according to the *Ghaydoul Lughat*, twelve Maḡāms (or modes) of which Husainī is the tenth.

⁶⁸ T.S.A., 48.

art of music were laudable. Under his patronage was written and to him was dedicated the *Lahjāt-i-Sikandar Shāhī*, a treatise on music by 'Umar Yahiyā.⁶⁹ Yahiyā was a scholar of Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit and his work is based on many Sanskrit treatises like *Sangīti Ratnākara*,⁷⁰ *Nṛīya Saṅgraha*, *Sangīti Kalpataru* and the works of Matang.⁷¹ Probably the *Lahjāt* is the first book in Persian on Indian music.

Promotion of Learning

Throughout the medieval period of Indian history the Sultans were keenly interested in the promotion of learning. Iltutmish, Balban and 'Alāuddīn Khaljī established a number of Madrasās in Delhi and elsewhere. During Firōz Tughlaq's reign numerous colleges and monasteries were established throughout the country. Besides, his various Kārkhānās provided vocational training to thousands of youngmen.

After Timūr's invasion not much is known about the educational system until Sikandar Lodī came to power. Himself a poet and litterateur, Sikandar encouraged learning in every way. He established Madrasās in all parts of his kingdom and appointed distinguished scholars to the charge of the colleges at Agra and other places. He wanted to raise the percentage of the educated, especially among the Afghans, and therefore insisted on compulsory education of his military officers.⁷² According to the author of the *Akhbār-i Akhyār*, the Sultan invited learned men from Arabia, Iran and Central Asia to India and many of them adopted Hindustan as their home. Shaikh Husain Tāhir, who lived during the reigns of Bahlūl and Sikandar, was known as a walking encyclopaedia.⁷³ Two distinguished brothers, Shaikh 'Abdulla and Shaikh 'Azīzullā Tulambī, were invited from Multan and appointed Principals of

⁶⁹ Islamic Culture, XXVIII, 1954, 411.

⁷⁰ By Śaṅg Deva, a contemporary of 'Alāuddīn Khaljī (1296-1316).

⁷¹ Islamic Culture, 1954, 414. A MS. of the *Lahjāt-i-Sikandar Shāhī* is in the Lucknow University Library. Another is in the Madras University Library.

⁷² T.A., I, 336.

⁷³ He died in 1503 and was buried at Delhi. T.D., 60-63; List., III, 158. *Akhbār-i Akhyār*, 195-6.

the colleges at Agra and Sambhal respectively. 'Abdulla⁷⁴ produced forty good disciples of whom Miān Ladhān, Jamāl Khan Dehlvi, Miān Shaikh of Gwalior and Miān Saiyyad of Badaon are well known.⁷⁵ Sikandar Lodī himself often attended 'Abdulla's lectures. He used to enter the class with silent steps, listened with humility, and when he left he offered the customary salutation.⁷⁶ Shaikh 'Azizullā's two distinguished disciples were Miān Hātim Sambhalī and Shaikh Ilāh Diya Jaunpuri. The Sultan founded schools at Mathura and Narwar also, which were open to all without discrimination of caste or creed.⁷⁷ Learning thus "spread in the country".⁷⁸

Two important points may be noted in connection with the educational system in the medieval times. The first is that there was hardly any secular approach to education. The location of Muslim and Hindu schools in masjids and temples respectively, was enough to give a religious bias to education. Hindu scholars concentrated on the study of religious books like the Vedas and Shāstras besides logic, grammar and literature. The subjects of study in Muslim schools likewise were of a religious nature. Great emphasis was laid on theological education (*manqūlāt*). Besides grammar, literature and logic, the other most important subjects were Hadīs (Tradition), Fiqh (Jurisprudence), and Tafsīr (Exegesis). In the words of Dr. Yūsuf Husain, "the institutions of higher learning in the Muslim countries, called Madrasās, had developed into centres of learning with a distinct religious bias. They were essentially schools of theology, with auxiliary linguistic studies. These Madrasās were the strongholds of orthodoxy and were subsidised by the State."⁷⁹

The second point of importance is that the standard of education was high. Education was neither compulsory nor universal. Only those who had a keen desire to acquire knowledge joined the schools. There were no printing presses, no text books, no "made-easy" notes. The students devoted their whole time and concen-

⁷⁴ He died in 1541 and was buried at Shaikh Sarāi, Delhi. List, III, 142; *Abdārui Akhyār*, 330-31.

⁷⁵ Islamic Culture, XXX, 1956, 110.

⁷⁶ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 427.

⁷⁷ Yūsuf Husain, *Glimpses of Medieval Indian Culture*, 74.

⁷⁸ T.A., I, 336; T.D., 44.

⁷⁹ Yūsuf Husain, *op. cit.*, 69.

trated attention to study; and lack of printed books necessitated strenuous taxing of the memory. Grammar was the basis of study of languages and there was no other short-cut for acquiring mastery over it. Religious and philosophical studies interspersed with high-brow discussions required a thorough grounding in the subject. Thus while only a few persons took to scholastic pursuits, those who joined schools and colleges took to their studies in right earnest.

Persian Literature

Although there were separate schools for Sanskrit and Persian studies, there were some Muslim scholars who learnt Sanskrit and Hindu scholars who learnt Persian. Muslims had learnt much from Hindu medicine, philosophy and astronomy, and translated many works on these subjects from Sanskrit into Persian. This was possible only when the translators possessed mastery of both the languages. Similarly Hindus too had started taking to the study of Persian. A contemporary Brahman scholar of Persian was Pundit Dongar Mal. He was a poet, a scholar and a professor of Persian.⁸⁰ He wrote both in Hindi and Persian, and his style combined the grace and mystic note of the Sūfī classics.⁸¹ Similarly a Muslim theologian, Shaikh Rizqulla (1491-1581), wrote lyrics on the love of Krishna in Hindi under the titles of *Wujūb-Jap-Nirānjan*, "the work being unfortunately lost to us".⁸²

Indeed from the days of Firōz Tughlaq onwards many works were translated into Persian from Sanskrit; Sanskrit possessed a rich Literature. Firōz Shāh Tughlaq got a work on Hindu Philosophy translated into Persian and named it *Dalāyat-i-Firōz Shāhī*. In the fifteenth century the work of translating Sanskrit works into Persian went on apace. King Zainul 'Ābidīn of Kashmir (1420-70) possessed good knowledge of Persian, Hindi and Tibetan. Under his patronage the *Mahābhārata* and *Rājatarangī* were translated into Persian. Jonarāja (d. 1459) carried on Kalhan's *Rājatarangī*

⁸⁰ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 426; Islamic Culture, XIII, 1939, 408-14.

⁸¹ A *matla'* (opening couplet) of his is full of feeling:

Had not thy glance been the dagger, my heart had not bled to-day;

Had not thy look been the serpent I never had lost my way.

(Cited in Badaoni, Ranking, I, 426).

⁸² N. B. Roy, *op. cit.*, xcii; *Akhbār-i Akhyār*, 174.

in the same style, his pupil Srivara covered the period from 1459 to 1486, while Priya Bhatta and his pupil Shuka carried on the tale to ■■■■ years after the annexation of Kashmir by Akbar.⁸¹

Miān Bhuā, the Prime Minister of Sikandar Lodī, got together many Indian and foreign scholars to write books on every science.⁸² He appointed physicians of India and Khurāsān to prepare a treatise on Medicine. They consulted works of "Charak, Sushrut, Jānu Karan, Bhoj . . . Chintāman, Chakrāvāt, Kirat and many others,"⁸³ and completed in A.D. 1512 a work called the *Tibb-i-Sikandarī* also known as the *Madanush-Shifāi Sikandarī*. The chief author of the work is mentioned ■■■■ Miān Bhuā, son of Khawās Khan and Minister of Sikandar.⁸⁴ In view of the fact that the works of so many scholars of medicine were consulted in the preparation of the treatise, the contention of 'Abdulla that it ■■■■ translation of a Sanskrit work entitled *Ayur Mahāvaidak*,⁸⁵ does not ■■■■ to be correct, more ■■■■ because the title *Ayur Mahāvaidak* is itself open to doubt. Obviously the *Madanush-Shifāi Sikandarī* was the result of years of patient research based on the works of many ancient masters of Indian Medicine "which were popular in those days". Both Rizqulla and 'Abdulla aver that "there is no work of greater authority on medicine in India" than the *Madanush-Shifāi-Sikandarī*.⁸⁶ Similarly many works of Persian were adapted into Indian languages. *Katha Kautuk* was written by Srivara on the theme of Yūsuf and Zuleikhā by the Persian poet Jāmi.⁸⁷

Besides works of translation many original works of merit were produced during this period. Muhammad bin Shaikh Zainuddin compiled a lexicon entitled *Farhang-i-Sikandarī* alias *Tuhfa-us-Sa'dāt*. A very uncommon work of its kind, it was completed in A.D. 1510 and dedicated to Sultan Sikandar.⁸⁸ Another famous writer of the time was Zahir Dehlvi. Sultan Sikandar conferred the title of Zahir ■■■■ him. Other writers of note ■■■■ Maulānā Hasan

⁸¹ Keith, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, 174.

⁸² W.M., 32 (a).

⁸³ The dots indicate portions which have been eaten away by worms in the MS. of the *Madanush-Shifāi Sikandarī*, 3 (a).

⁸⁴ B.M. Catalogue, II, 471.

⁸⁵ T.D., 44.

⁸⁶ W.M., 32 (a), T.D., 44. ■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■ published by the Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow.

⁸⁷ A. Barfield Keith, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, 361.

⁸⁸ British Museum Catalogue, II, 493.

Naqshī, Maulānā 'Alī Ahmad Nishānī and Nūru'l Haqq.⁸¹ But the greatest intellectual of the age was perhaps Shikh Jamāl Kambū. He was a theologian, poet and writer and a great traveller. Badaonī says that his Diwāns alone consisted of eight to nine thousand couplets. Shaikh Jamāl's real name was Shaikh Fazlulla *alias* Jamāl Khan.⁸² He was the author of a number of works of which *Siyār-ul-'Arifin*, *Masnavi Mohr O Māh* and the *Diwān* are well known.⁸³ The *Siyār-ul-'Arifin* is a biography of saints commencing from Khwāja Mu'nuddīn Ajmerī and finishing with the author's own spiritual guide, Shaikh Shamsuddīn. Jamāl's poetry vibrates with exalted passion.⁸⁴ Sikandar Lodī, himself a good poet, used to submit his verses to Shaikh Jamāl for his opinion.⁸⁵ Eleven lines of his composition in praise of the saint are still preserved in the *Makhzan-i-Afghānī*.⁸⁶

The list of the authors and works given above is obviously not complete or exhaustive. But it is indicative of the type of literature produced in the Persian language in the fifteenth century. The works of translation as well as the original ones cover a long

⁸¹ E and D, VI, 487.

⁸² *Akhbār-i Akhbar*, 227-29. ■■■ tomb is in Mehrauli. *Āsār*, 47; Carr Stephen, 173; Arch. Sur. Rep., IV, 67, 90.

⁸³ T.S.A., 47 and n. 1.

⁸⁴ Cf. "I wear a garment woven of the dust of thy street
And that too rent to the skirt with my tears."

Also

"My heart's desire is fixed on thy abode
Oh thou that art long absent from my sight;
By day and night the thought of thee alone
My constant partner is"

(Cited in Badaonī, Ranking, I, 429-30)

⁸⁵ Badaonī, Ranking, I, 429; Dorn, I, 89.

⁸⁶ Some of the lines express the Sultan's deep regard for the saint-poet

"Oh Jamāl, the store-house of eternal wealth,
The wayfarer of the path of faith.
You went round the world,

.....
You had been a jewel but now turned into a full treasury
.....

I may lose the sight of my eyes by the glare of the sun,
But the moon of your face will not be remote from me."

(Cited in *Makhzan*, 71 (a-b)).

range of subjects—medicine, philosophy, theology, lexicography, biography and poetry. Examples of lyrical poetry quoted here exhibit extreme delicacy of feeling and expression; passionate love and deep disappointment; the depth of mysticism and sufism. Similar works of mystic poetry were produced in other languages also (but of that a little later).

However, the Persian literature of the day was deficient in one major sphere—historical literature. Ever since the foundation of Turkish rule in Hindustan, many works of historical merit were produced, so that from the *Tājūl Ma'āsir* of Hasan Nizāmī to the systematic treatise of Shams Sirāj 'Alī a continuous history of two centuries is available to us. In fact there are various contemporaneous accounts for the reigns of the Khaljis and the Tughlaqs. But in the fifteenth century there is only one contemporary work, Yahyā bin Sarhīndī's *Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī*, dealing with the first thirty-four years of the Saiyyad rule. Although a single contemporary work covering a long period of about thirty-four years is hardly enough for giving a correct picture of the times, yet at least it is there. For the next three generations, in fact till the coming of Bābur, very little seems to have been written, and the period under review is sadly lacking in historical literature.

Arabic Works

Most of the Arabic works of the period were confined to commentaries on the Quran and Hadis. Saiyyad Muhammad, better known as *Gisū-darās* (1321-1422), was a very popular Sūfī saint of his times and wrote the *Ar-Risālah fī Masā'il Ruyat-ul-Bārī Ta'alā*. The Shafī'ite savant, 'Alī bin Ahmad Mahā'imi (d. 1431), of Arab extraction, wrote a commentary on the Quran and another on Fiqh entitled *Fiqh-i-Mahdūmī*. He also wrote several works on various Sūfī themes. Sa'aduddin Khairābādī (d. 1477) also wrote on Fiqh and Tasawwuf. Qāṣī Shihābuddin, entitled *Malikul 'Ulema* (d. 1445)⁷⁷ lived at Jaunpur in Ibrāhīm Sharqī's reign and wrote many books on Islam. Another scholar of Jaunpur of the same period was Shaikh Ilāh Diya Jaunpuri, the author of many excellent works like *Hedayat-i-Fiqh*, a commentary on Kāfiya, and notes on the

⁷⁷ Ferishta, II, 593; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, 932.

Tafsir-i-Madārik.⁹⁸ Similarly Badruddin Muhammad, who was born in Egypt in 1424, but migrated to Gujarat in 1517, also wrote a number of treatises on the Islamic religion. In the words of M. Ishaque, "... the authors who made any contribution to Arabic literature in India were Arabs or Persians or persons of Arab and Persian lineage.... Generally speaking, the works produced in India are on religious subjects, *tasawwuf* and grammar. They mostly comprise commentaries on the Quran, Hadis, Fiqh and grammar."⁹⁹

Sanskrit Literature

There was great literary activity in Sanskrit throughout the country. Of the Sanskrit writers on religion and philosophy in the fifteenth century the most famous are Rudradhara, Misāru Misra and Vāchaspati Misra of Bihar. Indeed, from the thirteenth century to the fifteenth, Smṛiti literature "flourished in Mithila so luxuriantly that the writers came to be regarded as forming a separate school".¹⁰⁰ Rudradhara wrote several works on Dharmashāstras including *Shuddhiviveka* and *Śrāddhāviveka*. The former deals with purification in all its aspects; while the latter with the Śrāddhas. Rudradhara belonged to the early years of the fifteenth century. To the middle of the century belonged Misāru Misra, the celebrated author of *Vivādhachandra*, dealing with laws and procedure, and *Padārtha-chandrikā*, dealing with the Nyāya Viśēshaka system. But the doyen of the Mithila writers was Vāchaspati Misra, who was adviser in Dharmashāstra of Mahārāja-dhīrāja Harinārāyana and his son Rūpnārāyana. He was a prolific writer having to his credit more than a dozen works. His *Vivādhchintāmani* holds a prominent position in Hindu law. He belongs to the latter part of the fifteenth and earlier part of the sixteenth century.¹⁰¹ About the same time (i.e. early sixteenth century, c 1510) Dalpat Rai, a Brahman officer in the army of Ahmad Shāh I of Gujarat, wrote an encyclopaedic work — *Dharmashāstra*.¹⁰² To this same period

⁹⁸ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 428-29.

⁹⁹ *The Delhi Sultanate*, 533.

¹⁰⁰ Cited in Ishwari Prasad, *Medieval India*, 350.

¹⁰¹ The dates of these Mithila writers have been discussed by Mehendale and Pusalkar in *The Delhi Sultanate*, 478-79.

¹⁰² Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 1951, Jaipur, 142.

belongs Raghunandan Misra of Bengal, a renowned commentator on the *Smṛiti*. Under the patronage of Madan Singh, who ruled (1425-50) over Gorakhpur and Champāran, was written the *Madan-pradīp* dealing with the various Sanskāras. Visheshwar Bhatta wrote the *Madanpārijata*, dealing with Sanskāras, under king Madanpāla, who ruled at "Kashtha ■ the Yamuna". Vallabhachārya in his *Anubhāshya* on the Brahmasūtras propounded the Suddhavaīta system or pure monism.

In Vijayānagar, literary activity in Sanskrit was ■ manifest. It was because the south was not long under direct Muslim influence. Sāyana, the famous commentator ■ the Vedas, served as Minister under Hari Hara II, and his brother Mādhava under Bukka. Krishna Dēva Raya was a great patron of Sanskrit and Telugu literature. "The numerous inscriptions show that ■ knowledge of Sanskrit was widely diffused and court-poets and writers were past-masters in drafting official documents."¹⁴³ The Jains also produced ■ great deal of religious and secular literature. A great Jain writer of the middle of the fifteenth century was Sakalakīrti.

Drama and poetry form the soul of Sanskrit literature, and ■ large number of *Kavyās* and dramas ■ written during the period of our study. To the early part of the fifteenth century belongs the *Pārvatī-Parinya* of Vāman Bhatta Bāna. Gangādharma wrote the *Gangādās-Pratāp-Vilāsa* which deals with the struggle of the Champanir prince, Gangadāsa Pratapdēva, against Muhammad II of Gujarat (A. D. 1443-52). In Bengal, Rūpa Goswāmī, Minister of Sultan Husain Shāh, composed the *Vidagdha Mādhava* and the *Lalitā Mādhava* about A. D. 1532.¹⁴⁴ The Dramas of Rūpa Goswāmī reveal poetical powers of ■ high order.

Ramchandra, son of Lakshman Bhatta, composed in 1524, *Rasik-ranjana* ■ Ayodhya which combines the erotic and ascetic sentiments. Vidyāranya of Vijāyanagar wrote the *Shankaravijaya*, supposed to contain a biography of the great Shankarachārya. Two other court poets of Vijāyanagar were Diwākar and Madhava. To this period also belongs the Gujarat historical *Kavya Gurugunā Ratnākara*, written by Somnath in 1485.

Many works were also produced on the science of grammar,

¹⁴³ Ishwari Prasad, *Medieval India*, 552.

¹⁴⁴ Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, 250-51.

lexicography and poetics. Ramchandra (A. D. 1400) wrote his *Prakriyā-kamudī* in which he has rearranged the material of Pāṇini. At Ahmadabad, in 1458, was written *Nyāyāratha-manjūsha*, a commentary on Hēnuchandra's grammar. Punjarāja, a minister of Ghayāsuddīn Khaljī of Malwa (1469-1500) wrote the *Sisuprabodh* ■ Alankāra. In Bengal some of the best commentaries on Pāṇini were written by Nandan Misra, Pundarik Vidyāsāgar and Srīman Misra. Lexicographers like Brahspati Rāyamukta, the famous commentator on the *Amarhoṣh* flourished during the fourteenth century and Appārāya in the fifteenth. Gangānanda, a court poet of Mahārāja Karna of Bikaner (1506-27) wrote the *Kāvyadakini* which deals with poetical blemishes (*doṣhas*). He also wrote *Karnābhūṣhana*, ■ treatise on poetical *rasas*. Works on music were a special feature of this period, and these were written both in the north and the south. *Malanga Bhārata* was written by Lakshmana Bhāskar in the fourteenth century. Vidyāranaya of Vijāyanagar wrote *Saṅgītsāra* on music. Similarly there were works written on medicine, astronomy, astrology and polity.

According to A. B. Keith production of Sanskrit literature had suffered in quality under Turkish rule. The later additions to *Rājtarangani* by Jonrāja, Srīvara and Prīya Bhatta were not so meritorious as the work of Kalhana himself.¹⁰⁴ Keith is also of the opinion that in the process of Turkish conquest Sanskrit drama "took refuge in those parts of India where Muslim power was the slowest to extend".¹⁰⁵ True, the creative period had long been a matter of the past; the "immense" quantity of production in every branch in general lacks originality. And yet the fifteenth century was not ■ period of stagnation. On the other hand the works of Vāchaspati Misra, Mādhavacharya and Vallabhachārya as well as those on music and grammar do credit to the period of our study.¹⁰⁷

Development of Regional Languages

Besides the work produced in classical languages, the fifteenth century in particular saw the development of Hindi and many

■ Keith, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, 174.

¹⁰⁴ Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, 242.

¹⁰⁷ Mehendale and Pusalkar in *The Delhi Sultanate*, 490.

other regional languages. Many causes contributed towards this development. Because of the new political set-up, stresses of the times, and lack of patronage from the kings, Sanskrit lost its old position. A common medium of expression was the natural outcome of the contact between the foreigners and Indians. Thus developed Hindustani, a great poet of which ■■■ Amīr Khusrū. ■■■ Hindustani or Hindvi later bifurcated into two channels of Hindi and Urdu. This was the position in Madhya Desa. In the various kingdoms into which the country had been divided consequent upon the invasion of Tīmūr, regional languages like Maithili, Bengali, Marathi and Gujarati developed rapidly under the patronage of their kings, and these were enriched by the writings of philosophers and poets. Because of all these factors the fifteenth century became an age of development of regional languages and their literatures.

The beginnings of all literatures are to be found in poetry, for man feels first and reasons afterwards. The first poet of Hindustani was Amīr Khusrū, Tūṭi-i-Hind ■■■ Parognet of India.¹⁰⁸ Khusrū was the first to employ Persian metres in Hindi, a language he loved and praised¹⁰⁹ and in which he wrote many couplets. By the fifteenth century Hindi had got a definite shape as is evident from the works of Kabir, Raidās and many other saints of the fifteenth century, whose contribution to the development of languages will be studied later on. Suffice it here to say that these saints travelled extensively. They preached in Hindi and most probably conversed with the people in the same language wherever they went. Thus Hindi ■■■ Hindustani ■■■ to have been understood all over northern India and had attained the position of a national language. However, it had its variations in various regions of the country. Rajasthani developed in Rajasthan, western Hindi (both Brajbhāsa and Khari bolī) in western U. P., Avadhi in eastern U. P. and Bihari in Bihar. Khari bolī did not become popular till the eighteenth century, but during the fifteenth century many books in Avadhī were written. Qutban, a disciple of Shaikh Burhān of the Chishtia order and a protege of the Sultan of Jaunpur composed, in 1501, his *Mrigāvatī*. It is a Rajput romance with little allegorical elements; but Manjhan's *Madhu-mālātī* (composed in

■ Ram Babu Saksena, *A History of Urdu Literature*, 10.

¹⁰⁹ *Ashiq*, ■ and D, III, Appendix, 356.

the early years of the 16th century) has great imagery and deep allegory.

The development of Urdu was very gradual and imperceptible. Hindi and Urdu are of the same parentage and in their nature they are not different from each other. Urdu, under the patronage of Muslim kings, sought inspiration from Persian while Hindi continued to draw from its original fount Sanskrit.¹¹⁰ Khwājā Bandā Nawāz Gīṣū-darāz (1321-1422), who lived in the Deccan, was the first writer of Deccan Hindi. His inspiring prose work, the *Mīrātul 'Ashiqān*, is replete with Arabic words, and is looked upon as the earliest work in the Urdu form of Hindi. Persian words are found interspersed in the writings of Kabīr and Jaisī also, and the foundations of Urdu were laid during our period of study.

As in the Madhya Desa, ■ also in Bengal, Sanskrit ceased to be a living language after its conquest by the Turks. In the absence of the printing press and with very few hand-written works existing, it became the exclusive care of the pandits. It lost touch with life and reality and "ploughed a lonely furrow in the barren fields of hyper-subtle scholasticism".¹¹¹ Muslim Sultans and nobles were interested in encouraging art and literature, and got Sanskrit books translated into Bengali. The first Bengali translation of the *Mahābhārata* was undertaken at the command of Sultan Nāsir Shāh in the fourteenth century. But the father of Bengali poetry was Krittivāsa Ojhā who translated the *Ramayana* in the fifteenth century (c. 1418).¹¹² Maladhar Vasu translated the *Bhāgavat Purāna* in 1473-1480 at the command of Sultan Rukanuddīn Bārbak Shāh, from whom he received the title of Gunarāj Khan.¹¹³ Sultan Husain Shāh of Gaur (1493-1519) patronised Vipradās Piplai and Vijaya Gupta, the author of *Mansū Mangal*.¹¹⁴ At the command of Pārangal Khan, a general of Husain Shāh, Kavindra Paramēśvara translated a larger portion of the *Mahābhārata*. From the early fifteenth century the tradition of reciting in Bengali the *Ramayana* and *Mahābhārata* stories and the stories relating to Krishna gained currency.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Saksena, *Urdu Literature*, 2.

■ J. C. Ghosh, *Bengali Literature*, 19.

■ Ghosh, *op. cit.*, 34-36.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 37.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 45-46.

¹¹³ S. K. Chatterjee in *The Delhi Sultanate*, 513.

Muslim sovereigns of Bengal rendered great service to Bengali language and literature by granting recognition to Bengali in their courts. Following their example, the Hindu Rajas of Bengal also began to patronise the language of the people. But still greater service to the cause of the language was done by the Vaishnava philosophers and Bhakti poets of Bihar and Bengal. In the twelfth century Jayadeva had written "his masterpiece"¹¹⁶, the *Gita Govind*. This lyrical epic was full of the passionate but divine love of Rādhā and Krishna. Chandī Das (A. D. 1417-78) and Vidyāpati (A. D. 1433-81) wrote equally beautiful lyrical poetry in Bengali and Maithili. Besides devotional songs, Vidyāpati wrote historical poems also. His historical poem *Kirtilātā* describes an episode in the life of his patron Hindu Raja. Incidentally it gives a very vivid picture of the life of Jaumpur city of his day. Chaitanya also himself contributed much to Bengali lyrical poetry.¹¹⁷ In the opinion of D. C. Sen, the author of the monumental work entitled the *History of the Bengali Language and Literature*, Bengali was raised to the status of a literary language by the Vaishnava hymn writers just as Pali was by the Buddhists.¹¹⁸

In Maharashtra also the Bhakti poets from Namdēva onwards enriched the regional Marathi language. The Abhangs of the Maratha bhakts have a soul-stirring appeal and are sung even to this day in the villages and towns of Maharashtra. So also is the case with the religious songs of Narsi Mehta (1415-81) and his followers in Gujarat. In the Punjab, Guru Nānak gave a new religion and also a new script—Gurmukhī (meaning from the Guru's lips)—to the people. His compositions like *Āsa-dī-war*, *Jappī*, *Dākhni Onhār* and *Sikh Goshī*, though devoid of any pretensions to literary perfection, are works of excellent merit. Equally important is the emergence of the Apabhramsa literature of the Jains of this period. Up to the eleventh century the Jains stuck to Sanskrit, but afterwards their philosophical and poetical works began to be written in the language of the people. In the Apabhramsa, rhyme, which is regarded as a speciality of modern Indian languages, is profusely

¹¹⁶ D.C.Sen, *A History of Bengali Literature*, 194. Kailth, *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, Heritage of India series, 121.

¹¹⁷ Ghosh, *op. cit.*, 39 n.

¹¹⁸ Sen, *op. cit.*, Introduction.

used; and ■ gave shape to the Kanarese and Tamil languages in the south.

General Remarks

In conclusion it may be noted that in the cultural sphere the fifteenth century was a period of great activity. It contributed much to art and literature. Imperial as well as provincial architecture provided motifs to Mughal architecture. Dance and music flourished as never before. They received the patronage of kings and the people; besides many works ■ music were produced during this period. Similar was the case with regard to the other fields of art, science and literature in which many works of merit were produced both in Persian and Sanskrit. Hindi took a definite shape; the Sant Kavyās and Vaishnava hymns are a special feature of this period. Almost all regional languages developed and flourished. In the political field, the first half of the fifteenth century was a period of decay; the second half of upheavals; but in the cultural field it was an age of sustained progress. There was a continuous progress of synthesis in spite of all conflicts—political, social and intellectual. In fact these conflicts provided an urge for synthesis and counteracted the reactionary tendencies which have been sometimes emphasised by the careless exaggerations of historians.

Chapter 12

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE

TO RECAPTURE a comprehensive picture of the social life of Medieval India from the writings of those times is rather a difficult task. Persian chroniclers excel in the narrative of political events; they callously neglect to refer to the life and activities of the common man. Hindu historical literature giving "the Hindu point of view" is conspicuous by its absence. Fortunately a number of itineraries of foreign travellers are available, and when read with the writings of the Indian historians give a tolerably satisfactory picture of the social life of India in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The writings of Marco Polo, Amīr Khusrū and Ibn Battūta in the preceding centuries provide a good back-drop to the accounts of Abdur Razzāq, Athanasius Nikitin, Nicolo Conti and many others in the fifteenth century. What their writings lack is made up by Bābur's faithful Memoirs, who writes in detail about the early years of the sixteenth century.

Thus in spite of the scantiness of historical material on the social life of the country, a fairly good picture of it can be visualised from the sources which are available. Not only that : from the writings of Alberunī, Ibn Battūta and Bābur it is clearly seen that medieval Indian society was not static, as is commonly believed, but that its pattern was constantly changing with the passage of time although the changes were neither sudden nor glaringly perceptible. The picture of society depicted by fifteenth century travellers, in many ways, is quite different from the one delineated by Ibn Battūta, and Bābur's Hindustan had changed much since the days of the Moroccan traveller.

Rural Life

From times immemorial, and because of its geographical peculiarities, India has been an agricultural country. Consequently, except for a small minority, its vast population has lived in the villages down to our own times. In the fourteenth-fifteenth century India,

agriculture was the main occupation of the rural population. The vastness of land had made life easy and inexpensive. Rainfall in the country was abundant.¹ Artificial [] of irrigation were not necessary, although they were not unknown.² But there [] no safeguard against the vagaries of nature. Droughts brought about collapse in the peasant's economy as he depended almost entirely on nature and its seasonal cycle. The vagaries of nature, [] the one hand, made him a worshipper of "gods" of nature like the sun, the clouds, the rain, etc. and, on the other hand, a fatalist.

Besides there was no incentive to increased production. The produce sufficed for the then existing population. Tīmūr's invasion wrought a breakdown in the revenue administration. In the early part of the fifteenth century no agrarian measures seem to have been instituted, still less, enforced³. Each iqta'dār or Hindu chief collected the revenue of his little "kingdom . . . very much as he chose".⁴ The law and order situation improved in the latter half of the fifteenth century. The kings of Medieval India were ever keen on bringing down the prices of the necessities of life. It is with a sense of satisfaction, nay even of pride, that Muslim writers like Ziyāuddīn Baranī, Shams Sirāj 'Afif and 'Abdulla write about the cheapness of prices in their times.⁵ Sikandar Lodī used to keep a constant watch [] the price-level in the market.⁶ During his reign, corn duties were abolished, and merchants carried on their business in security. During the reign of Ibrāhīm Lodī, writes 'Abdulla, "Corn, cloth and other things were cheaper than they had been in any other reign, excepting the closing years of 'Alāuddīn's reign. It is said that ten maunds of corn, five *sērs* of *ghī*, and ten yards of cloth could be purchased for a single Bahloī".⁷ Thus

¹ B.N. (B), II, 319. Also *Travels of Sidi 'Ali Reis* (1533-6), 23.

² B.N. (B), II, 486-7, 319.

³ Moreland, *The Agrarian System of Moslem India*, 60-67.

⁴ Moreland, *op. cit.*, 67.

⁵ T.F.S. (B), 318-19; *Alqal.*, 56-57; F.F., 100; T.D., Bankipore MS., 223-24.

⁶ T.A., I, 338; Farishta, I, 187.

⁷ T.D., 136 ff. According to Abul Fazl a *Bahloī* (which previously was called *Jhal* and in his days *dām*) was a copper coin equivalent [] 1 *tola*, 8 *maṣārs* and 7 *raṣṣas*. It was 1/40 of the *Rupiyā*. On the one side of it was the mint-plate, on the reverse, the year and the month.

Ain., Blochmann, I, 32; Also Thomas, *Chronicles*, 359-60.

food, the chief necessity of life, was cheap and abundant. There being no urge for increased production, no attempt was made to improve agricultural implements and they remained the same over the centuries.

The second necessity, shelter, was also easily available. "In Hindustan," writes Bābur, "hamlets and villages, towns indeed, are depopulated and [] up in a moment. If the people of a large town, one inhabited for years even, flee from it, they do it in such a way that not a sign or trace of them remains in a day or a day and a half. On the other hand, if they fix their eyes on a place in which to settle, (they) just [] in. They make a tank [] dig a well; they need not build houses or set up walls—khas-grass abound, wood is unlimited, huts are made, and straightaway there is a village or a town!"⁹ The dense growth of jungles also provided good protection for the people.¹⁰ It was because of this that Muslim conquest could not penetrate the Indian village nor Muslim rule affect it. There were emperors and Sultans in the metropolis, but in the villages little republics with a self-sufficient economy continued. And if there was any fear of attack the villagers just fled and re-established themselves after the storm [] over.¹¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that in spite of the ruthless character of Muslim rule in Hindustan, Bābur notes (without making any comment) that "most of the inhabitants of Hindustan are pagans; they call a pagan a Hindu".¹¹

Such were the teeming millions of Hindustan, dwelling in villages, unaccustomed to the city's ignoble strife, and dependent upon the mercies of nature. The life of the man behind the plough was not bleak. If the absence of the conception of welfare state had made

⁹ B.N. (B), II, 487-88. B.N. (L & E), 313, n. 2, cites from Col. Wilks, *Historical Sketches*, I, 309 note, to show that similar conditions prevailed in south India. In [] words of Col. Wilks "On the approach of a hostile army, the . . . inhabitants of India bury under ground their most cumbersome effects, and each individual, man, woman, and child, . . . with a load of grain apporportioned to their strength, issue from their beloved homes [] take the direction of a country . . . exempt from the miseries of war; sometimes of a strong fortress, but [] generally [] the most unfrequented hills and woods . . ." They called this emigration *waka*.

¹⁰ B.N. (B), II, 487. Cf. I.B., 124.

¹¹ Cf. Havell, *Aryan Rule in India*, 407-09.

¹² B.N. (B), II, 518.

the peasant live in penury, he had his moments of joy. If occasional famines made his life miserable, the timely arrival of rain (in spite of the inconvenience it caused him in his leaky mud-walled thatched-roof house) must have filled his heart with joy. Cut off from the sophisticated life of the city, his few wants were happily met by the self-sufficient village economy. The village barber, the cobbler, the horse-shoe maker and the ever important Baniś satisfied his little requirements. The joint family system afforded him protection; the village panchāyat gave his minor grievances a just redress. If there was little to spare, there was sufficient to live by, and the numerous festive occasions which encouraged community dance, *Kathū* and dinners must have filled his soul with joy.

Urban Life

The standards of cultural life and social behaviour of a people ■ best reflected in their urban life. Cities in Medieval India were few, but they were large and impressive. Foreign travellers like Nikitin and Barbosa give a favourable comparison of Indian cities with those of Europe. Cities and towns generally were built on the pattern of the metropolis. The Delhi of that period consisted of many "cities" grouped together, each having a special name.¹² The lay-out of Delhi gives an idea of the life of its residents ■ well ■ of those of the provincial capitals, port-towns and other important cities. From a study of the accounts of the fourteenth century it appears that there were separate quarters built for different classes of people.¹³ There ■ the palace of the Sultan, a cantonment ■ for the troops, quarters for the ministers, the secretaries, the Qazis, Shaikhs and faqirs. "In every quarter there were to be found public baths, flour mills, ovens and workmen of all pro-

¹² Besides Delhi proper, the other chief townships were Siri (founded by 'Alauddin Khalji), Tughlaqābād (founded by Ghazi Tughlaq), Jāhān Panāh (residence of Muhammad Tughlaq) and Firōz Shāh's city and fort (Kotla). *Taqwīm al-Buldān*, ■ cited in *Alqal.*, 27; I.B., Def. and Sarg., III, 146; H.C. Hearn, *The Seven Cities of Delhi*.

al-Qalqāshidī, quoting Shaikh Abū Bakr, says, "All the cities of Delhi to which the name of Delhi is given are twenty-one in number".

¹³ *Masālik*, B and D, III, 576; *Alqal.*, 30; T.P.S. (B), 318. Also C.H.J., III, 110 ff.

fessions . . ."¹⁴ The author of *Masālikul Absār* writes: "The houses of Delhi are built of stone and brick, the roofs are of wood and the floor is paved with white stones resembling marble. The houses are not built more than two storeys high, and often are made of only one."¹⁵ Besides, there must have been hut-like houses of the poor huddled together in congested localities.

The Elite

The most important individual in the metropolis was the Sultan. As a ruler as well as the leader of the society he set the standards of fashion and patterns of behaviour. He ■■■ believed to be the richest person in the country as there was ■■ distinction between his privy purse and the State treasury, but none of the Sultans seem to have built up ■ fund of personal wealth.¹⁶ In law the Sultan was expected to live a life of frugality;¹⁷ in practice most of the Sultans expended all their revenues on cities, palaces, the royal household, gardens, the army and the nobles.¹⁸

Vast expenses were incurred on the seraglio of the Sultan who married as many women as he liked. Two facts may be remembered in this connection. Firstly, women had no "rights" in those days. Secondly, the absence of scientific inventions necessitated the manual labour of human hands in providing for the comforts of the rich, and women were preferred ■■ companions and servants.

State work claimed most of the Sultan's time, but since there was not much "office work", rest and recreation, too, he had in abundance. Almost ■ the Sultans were fond of sport, both big-game shooting as well as taming and flying birds. A large number of falconers¹⁹ and pigeon-boys²⁰ ■■ employed to keep the birds in trim. South Indians were also "much addicted" to fowling and hunting.²¹ The Sultan spent a considerable amount of his

¹⁴ *Masālik*, E and D, III, 376.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 376.

■ Muhammad Tughlaq bequeathed to his ■■■ a depleted treasury, and Firōz Tughlaq had often to borrow money from Sāhūkārā when he went on campaigns. T.F.S. (A), 52, 53, 56, 61.

Some of the Hindu Rajas of the Deccan were far richer than the Sultans of Delhi. Wassūf, 352; Yule, *Ser Marco Polo*, II, 323; Also Abdur Razāq.

¹⁷ T.F.S. (B), 293-94.

¹⁸ *Alqal.*, 29.

¹⁹ *Alqal.*, 68.

²⁰ T.F.S. (B), 328.

²¹ Nicolo Conti, 22.

time in the company of his personal friends and courtiers (*nadîms*).²² The *nadîms* were generally those nobles who enjoyed the Sultan's intimacy. Their nearness to the king rendered them influential.²³

The Sultans of the first half of the fifteenth century were comparatively poor both financially and in personal attainments. Their resources were limited. They could not live up to the standards of the fourteenth century kings. At least they could not indulge in criminal waste on such things as gold horse-shoes or gold bathtubs.²⁴ All the same they lived the normal life of luxury. Poets and musicians and dancers provided Mubārak Shāh Saiyyad and 'Alāuddīn 'Ālam Shāh with the usual recreation.²⁵ By the latter half of the fifteenth century much of the glory and prosperity seems to have returned as is clear from the description of the coronation Darbārs of Sikandar Lodī and Ibrāhīm Lodī.²⁶

As high dignitaries of the State, army officers, companions of the king, etc. the nobles occupied a position only next to the Sultan in the social life of the capital city and other cities of the Sultanate. The nobility of the Sultanate was composed of all sorts of foreigners and Indians. In the beginning the Turks formed the bulk of the cadre, but later — Mughals, better known as neo-Muslims, Arabs, Egyptians, Afghans, as well as Indian Muslims began to obtain high positions. The Afghans predominated in the fifteenth century both in numbers and in influence. They were entitled Amīrs, Maliks and Khans. Their salaries were high and they held high administrative and military assignments.²⁷ Though the figures of the salaries of nobles for the fourteenth century cannot be accepted for the fifteenth, the emoluments still seem to

²² T.F.S. (A), 143-45.

²³ A long train of officials like Khāṣṣadār (personal attendant), Sharbdār (keeper of drinkables) Sāqī-i-Khāṣ (personal cup-bearer), and Chāshnigir (taster of food) made arrangements for the convivial assemblies (*majlis-i-ash*) of the king, at which he and his *nadîms* used to get virtually "soaked in wine".

²⁴ T.F.S. (B), 357-58.

²⁵ I.B., 69, 73.

²⁶ T.M.S., 211.

²⁷ *Makhzan*, 72 (a).

²⁸ Every Khan received two lakh *tanhās*, every Malik from 50 to 60 thousand *tanhās*, every Amīr from 40 to 50 thousand *tanhās* and — on. Land too was assigned to Khans, Maliks and Amīrs (Alqal., 71). Similar is the testimony of Ibn Battūta (I.B., 129) and Shams Sirāj 'Ain. T.F.S. (A), 296-97, 437-38.

have been considerable. Important nobles held high positions as governors of provinces and commanders in the army, and tried to emulate the Sultan in every way. In the latter half of the fifteenth century some of the nobles built mansions as would almost rival the King's palace.²⁰ Their wealth introduced into their lives all the uses and abuses of luxury. Woman and wine and song and chess²¹ and *chaugan* were their common pastimes.²² But their way of life did not always sap their vitality. Almost all the noblemen of the medieval period were fond of field sports and swordsmanship, and were keenly interested in military exercises. Many amongst them were "learned, humble, polite and courteous",²³ Almost all were patrons of art and letters.

In the fourteenth century, especially under strong kings, the nobles served the State loyally. But during the period under review, when the Sultanate had become weak, many a nobleman had established his independent State. Even the iqta'dārs oftentimes flouted the authority of the Sultanate. In these circumstances it is not surprising that from Mallū Iqbāl Khan to Sarwarul Mulk there were many noblemen who in many ways were more powerful than the king himself. Be that as it may, the presence of high officers and nobles in the city lent it a certain lustre.

The 'Ulema and the Mashāikh formed another small section of the city people. The 'Ulema learnt logic and philosophy, studied and interpreted the Shar' and generally held high judicial appointments. Though not quite rich, they were universally respected for their learning and piety.

Then there were the Sūfī saints and Hindu Yogīs. They were spread all over the country and used to keep in intimate touch with the common people. They had dedicated themselves to the devotion of God. In the writings of the fourteenth century there are many references about the life and activities of the saints, and it would be right to presume that the same pattern continued in the fifteenth century. Reverence for the saints almost bordered

²⁰ E.g. the Barā Khambā in Delhi. Percy Brown, *Indian Architecture, Islamic Period*. According to Ibn Battūta the cost of a nobleman's mansion ranged from four to six thousand gold *tankās* (dinārs), I.B., 141.

²² W.M., 37 (b). ²³ T.S.A., 42.

²¹ I.B., 13.

on worship.³⁴ Even the kings were very respectful towards the saints to whom they gave liberal grants.³⁵ But the true saints shunned all offers of gift or service.³⁶

Muslim saints were not necessarily ascetics.³⁷ Chronicles dealing with the fifteenth century history abound in love stories of *darweshes* and *faqirs* (mendicants)³⁸ who seem to be quite in evidence both in the cities and villages.³⁹ They helped in creating a healthy social and political atmosphere. Respected by kings and commoners alike they played the part of peace-makers in times of war. Shaikh Sadruddin interceded with Timūr in behalf of the Hindu ruler of Bhatnir. Shaikh Ahmad helped in the release of many prisoners Timūr had taken in India. Similarly because of Shaikh Ilmuddin's efforts peace was concluded between Iqbāl Khan and Bahrām Turkbachchā of Samana, and Saiyyad Shamsuddin tried to bring about reconciliation between Dariyā Khan and Khawājā Bāyezīd, the son of Bhalūl. Similarly in the early years of the sixteenth century Shaikh Yūsuf Qattāl tried to stop the war between Islām Khan of Kara and Ibrāhīm Lodī. There are numerous other instances of their role as peace-makers in the fifteenth century.

Rich and poor, high and low,⁴⁰ men and women, all used to become disciples of saints. Their Khanqāhs (monasteries) were the meeting place of scholars, nobles and commoners, and centre of the

³⁴ F.F., 118. A.F., 57. Common forms of paying respects were by touching the feet and placing of one's head on the saint's feet. Hugging and embracing were done for greeting. A.F., 59.

³⁵ I.B., 70; T.F.S. (A), 179.

³⁶ R.Q., 39-40; F.F., 80-81; S.A., 102. T.S.A., 36.

³⁷ Shaikh Fariduddin Shakarganj married four wives and had five children and three daughters (R.Q., 3). Shaikh Qutbuddin Saiyyad Husain Kirmānī, uncle of the author of *Siyar-ul-Auliya*, used to put on garments of the finest Chinese silks and Kamkhwābs, and always used to have *pān* in his mouth (S.A., 186). Shaikh Nizāmuddin also used to relish betel (S.A., 125). But on the whole the saints lived a life of simplicity. Poverty was their ornament (R.Q., 20), and because of impecuniosity Nizāmuddin had to go without dinner on many a day. (S.A., 101).

³⁸ There is an interesting anecdote about a *faqir* and the bride of son of Tatar Khan. T.S.A., 53-54; W.M. 19 (b), 20 (a-b).

³⁹ Ahmad Yādgār relates another story about the love of a *darwesh* and a woman. T.S.A., 101-102.

Love between a Hindu girl and a *darwesh* created a flutter. T.S.A., 106.

⁴⁰ T.S.A., 125. ⁴¹ F.F., 190, 191. Also S.A. 102.

books written by their disciples constitute a valuable source of social history. Musical concerts were a ■■■■■ feature at the Khanqāhs, and Qawwāls used to pass whole nights singing the praise of the Almighty. Great trust was reposed in the spiritual power of the saints; popular superstition credited them with the possession of supernatural powers.³⁹ Although the Sūfī saints could not rise above the superstitions of the age and believed in alchemy and miracles,⁴⁰ yet they, unlike the Mullās, clung not to the letter of the Holy Book but ■ its spirit. Their renunciation, simplicity and piety had a salutary effect upon the lives of the people.⁴¹ Large-scale conversions of the Hindus were due not to the efforts of the rulers, 'Ulema or Mullā, but those of the Sūfī saints.

Unlike the Muslim saints and *darwēshes*, the Hindu Yogis and Sanyasis were celibates and lived a life of renunciation and austerity.⁴² Marco Polo and Ibn Battūta met such ascetics and their description shows that the Yogis were very much in evidence all over the country throughout the medieval times,⁴³ and like the Muslim saints they seem to have enjoyed universal respect. But they did not and probably could not do any proselytising work. Being ascetics, they even kept away from the people. All the same, contact of the people with Muslim saints and Hindu Yogis⁴⁴ helped in the evolution of Hindu-Muslim understanding as both were revered by all sections of the people.⁴⁵

The Commoners

The privileged classes in the cities consisted mainly of the nobles and high government officials. The rest of the people were commoners. The so-called middle-class of today was non-existent in Medieval India. Even the rich Baniā dared not live luxuriously or parade his wealth for fear of appearing to emulate the great and thereby inviting their wrath; he lived without any ostentation, like a poor man. There were thus only two classes—the

³⁹ P.F., 209-210; T.F.S. (B), 330-32; T.S.A. 27.

⁴⁰ A.F., 95; I.B., 164-66.

⁴¹ T.F.S. (B) 341.

⁴² I.B., 164.

⁴³ Marco Polo, II, 300; I.B. 164-66. Also *Islamic Culture*, VIII, 1934, 478-79; I.B., 164; *Def. and Sang.*, IV, 33 ff.

⁴⁴ P.F., 69, 141, 199.

⁴⁵ I.B., 164, 165, 166.

privileged and the commoners. Indian and foreign writers like Shams Sirāj 'Asif, Ibn Battūta and Athanasius Nikitin were struck by the disparity that existed between the luxurious life of the rich on the one hand and the miserable existence of the common people on the other.⁴⁶ Ibn Battūta, although a nobleman himself, also dilates upon the life of want of the common man.⁴⁷

The commoners can be divided into two major sections—Hindus and Musalmāns. The Hindus were divided into many castes and sub-castes, and the system had unconsciously permeated into the Muslim society also.⁴⁸ But caste distinctions were more prominent in the villages than in the cities. Among the Hindus, the highest caste ■■■ that of the Brahmans. In the post-Vedic period, their superiority had been challenged by the other classes, especially the Kshatriyas, who alone perhaps could stand up to them, but deliberate rewriting of books and use of the system of education for the purpose, had re-established Brahmanical superiority. In law as well as in practice the Brahmans enjoyed all kinds of privileges.⁴⁹ For the Brahmans, therefore, life in ancient India was a golden age, and so they have made it out to be. One of the reasons why ancient Indian times look so glorious is because only the Brahmans, who were enjoying the best of time, have written about them. We do not have the Shudra version or the Vaishya version of the story of the ancient times to have ■ complete picture of the age. Brahmanical superiority continued right up to the coming of the Muslims.

With the advent of Islam the position of the Brahmans in Indian society received a set-back. Although they were exempted from taxes which other Hindus paid, they were no longer advisers or ministers of the Sultans. The destruction of temples in preceding centuries must have affected their social and economic position ■■ priests and teachers, but in the fifteenth century Hindus had regained much power. Hindu learning also revived; it put its impress on the teachings of the Socio-religious reformers about whom ■■ shall read in the next chapter. Consequently the position of the

⁴⁶ Major, *loc. cit.*; Nikitin, 14; Cf. also I. B., 60 and T.F.S. (A), 288-89.

⁴⁷ I.B., 60; Also T.F.S. (A), 288-89. ⁴⁸ Cf. W.M., 63 (b).

⁴⁹ K.M. Panikkar, *Survey of Indian History*, 17. He writes on the authority of Pargitar and Sukthankar.

Brahmans improved during ■■■ period of study. Besides, among the Hindus the Brahmans always enjoyed a position of respectability.⁴⁰

Another influential and respected caste was that of the Kshatriyas. The higher among the Kshatriyas were Rajas, their nobles and high officials. The lower among them were enrolled in the army. Their's was the profession of warriors; they mostly joined the army of the Hindu Rajas. Kshatriyas ■■■ to have enjoyed all rights of citizenship and could hardly brook an insult. They dressed in white,⁴¹ rode on horses and bore themselves with dignity and pride. Howsoever much their bearing might have been resented by the ruling class,⁴² they could not be completely suppressed. Besides soldiering they took to other professions also and became artisans and craftsmen and agriculturalists.

During the fourteenth century the Kshatriyas had been reduced to the position of big zamindars and petty rulers, except in Rajputana. But after Timūr's invasion they had gathered strength. Gwalior had been taken by them not to be recovered till the sixteenth century. Katēhār had become entirely Hindu. Hindus in general and Kshatriyas in particular had never been so strong ever since Muhammad Ghori's invasion as they were in the first half of fifteenth century Hindustan.

The Vaishya community ■■■ mostly engaged in agriculture, trade and commerce. We do not hear of the big Marwāri merchants in the Sultanate period. Trade was mostly confined to the Sindhis, called Multanis by Ziyauddin Baranī, and the Vaishya community. As we shall see presently trade and industry were in a flourishing state in the fifteenth century, and the Vaishya class benefited by it immensely.

Low caste Hindus and converts to Islam generally manned the various minor professions, although the occupational castes were not all low. These occupational castes comprised brewers, goldsmiths, iron-smiths, tin-workers, carpenters, tailors, betel-leaf

⁴⁰ When Firōz Tughlaq imposed Jaziya on the Brahmans, there was protest from ■■■ sides, and when the Sultan would grant them no concession, the merchant-class promised to pay the Jaziya on their behalf. T.F.S. (A), 382-84.

⁴¹ People generally wore white clothes I.B., xlvii.

⁴² As by Jalāluddin Khafī, T.F.S. (B), 216-17.

(tāmbul) seller, flower sellers, oilmen, barbers, jugglers, mountebanks, musicians, shepherds and still others.⁵² The Muslims could neither be divided on a caste basis — on the basis of occupation. The higher stratum confined themselves to Government service and the lower amongst them, mostly converts from Hinduism, stuck to their old professions; and although the lower class Muslim converts enjoyed the satisfaction of belonging to the ruling class, they remained as insignificant as their Hindu counterparts.

Position of Women

No study of a society can be complete without a reference to the position of women in it. The position of women in a society has an importance of its own; it reflects the standard of its civilisation.

Hindu law provides a fair if not a high position to women in society. Manu has said, "where women are not honoured, there cannot be a proper home".⁵⁴ Perhaps because of a woman's physical disabilities and old unwritten but practical custom, she was accorded a status of dependence on man.⁵⁵ Though there was no free mixing of sexes or universal education among women in Ancient India, foreign writers were struck by the freedom Indian women enjoyed. They freely participated in Yagyas, Court-ceremonial, fairs and even fought in battles.⁵⁶ Women could not only freely take to the study of art and literature, but were encouraged and recommended to do so.⁵⁷ The two centuries preceding the Muslim conquest saw poetesses like Indulākhā, Mārulā, Morikā, Vijjikā, Shilā, Subhadrā, Padmashrī and Lakshmi.⁵⁸ Besides there were painters, dancers, mathematicians, etc. among women of high families.⁵⁹

⁵² Ashraf, 193; Jaisi, *Padmāvat*, 154, 413.

⁵⁴ *Manusmṛiti*, Chapter, III, 55-60.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, Chapter IX, 327-28; *Yagyavalkya Smṛiti*, 37. Shams Siṣṭī 'Atfī, who cites from the Qurān also to emphasise the dependence of girls, adds, دختران بنایات ضعیف و نام شکسته خاطر اند و محکوم خیرے (Daughters are very weak, always dejected and subordinate to others). T.F.S. (A), 351.

⁵⁶ Hsien Tsang as quoted in G.S. Ojha, *Madhya Kālīn Bhārāṭīya Saṁskṛiti*, 66. Abu Zaid, E and D, I; Al Idrisi E and D, I, 77-78.

⁵⁷ Cf. the views of Rajasekhara. Nagri Pracharini Sabha Bulletin (Hindi), New Edition, Part II, 80-85.

⁵⁸ Ojha, *op. cit.*, 65.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 65.

With the Muslim conquest the position of Indian women suffered a set-back. After the fall of every city, and sometimes even in times of peace, women suffered every kind of privation. Historians like Ziya-ud-din Barani and Shams Sirāj 'Asif hint at it,⁶⁰ while Ibn Battūta's narrative makes revolting reading.⁶¹ As a bulwark against these humiliations Jauhar and Sati, already prevalent in Hindu society, began to be practised on a large scale in times of war. In times of peace Parda (seclusion) and child-marriage were considered to be good safeguards. The custom of *ghūnghai* among Hindus is described by Vidyapati and Malik Muhammad Jaisi,⁶² but the "more developed form of Parda, with its elaborate code of rules, came into existence almost from the beginning of the Muslim rule in Hindustan".⁶³ Life of women was restricted in Muslim society; Firōz Tughlaq and Sikandar Lodi forbade the pilgrimage of women to the tomb of saints.

A word may here be said about the important though cruel customs of Sati and Jauhar prevailing in medieval times. With the loss of power and constant danger of attack, the customs of Sati and Jauhar were gaining strong roots not only among the Kshatriyas, but among other people also. However, the most significant fact about these customs is that except perhaps by Muhammad Tughlaq, no serious attempt was made to put a stop to such an inhuman system of self-immolation. On the other hand it was universally admired. Even an extremely cultured man like Amīr Khusru exclaimed: "See how noble it is".⁶⁴ Ibn Battūta witnessed the Sati on many occasions and gives many unhappy details.⁶⁵ Jauhar was prevalent both in the north and the south.⁶⁶ During Timūr's invasion Muslim women also performed Jauhar when Bhatnir was sacked.⁶⁷

⁶⁰ T.F.S. (B), 384; T.F.S. (A), 36-39.

⁶¹ I.B., 63, 123.

⁶² *Paddaoli Bangya* of Vidyapati, Tra. Coomaraswami and Arun Sen, London, 1923, lix. Also Macauliffe, VI, 347.

⁶³ Ashraf, 245.

⁶⁴ Islamic Culture, XXX, 1945, 4-5. The following couplet of Khusru is worth reproducing.

وہ عجب چون زن ہندی کسی پر ولہ نیست مرنے کو جمع مردہ کای ہر پر ولہ نیست

⁶⁵ I.B., 21, 22, 109.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 96.

⁶⁷ Z.N., II, 74-75. Also M.T., E and D, III, 426.

Whatever may be said in favour ■ otherwise of the customs of Sati and Jauhar, ■ society in which female infanticide, child-marriage, Parda, Jauhar and Sati existed side by side, was not a happy one for women. It is not surprising therefore that the birth of ■ female child was felt like the advent of a calamity, and Amīr Khusrū's lament over the birth of a daughter and his many pieces of advice to her in his poem *Lailā Majnū*, make interesting reading.⁶⁸ In *Afzalul Fawaid* Nizāmuddīn Auliya has been cited as saying: "It would be the day of Resurrection (Qīāmat) when women will ride horses or walk about in the streets . . . Great harm would be done when women would get freedom".⁶⁹

But conditions could not have been the same everywhere and at all times. In the fifteenth century Sultanate there were many Muslim women like Bibi Matto, Ni'āmat Khātūn, Shams Khatūn, Bibi Rāji and Bibi Khunza, who were accomplished and wielded influence at the court and in the country's life. In the south or in Gujarat where Muslim conquest was belated or incomplete, none of the above customs existed and women continued to enjoy a fairly good position in society.⁷⁰ The position of Hindu women was equally good. The chronicles write about the weakening of the Sultanate and the emergence of many strong Hindu States in northern India during the period under study. They do not mention many Jauhars ■ forced matrimonial alliances. On the other hand there is mention of many talented Hindu women interested in art, philosophy and religion in the fifteenth century.⁷¹ To the Hindu woman who did not stray away from the standards laid down by Manū, her husband was her lord, her master and her god, and many stories are told of the conjugal devotion of Hindu women in the literature of the period under review.⁷²

Dress

As noted earlier, the standards of culture of a people are best reflec-

⁶⁸ Shibli Naumani, *Shatrul 'Afam*, II, 123.

⁶⁹ *Afzalul Fawaid*, 78-79.

⁷⁰ Major, Nikitin, 16.

⁷¹ *Bihar Through the Ages*, 414. Conditions in Bihar also naturally apply to other parts of the country.

⁷² T.S.A., 45, 107. Also *The Delhi Sultanate*, 511.

ted in the life of the cities. In the cities were to be seen costumes and dresses of various kinds. The Sultan, the nobles, all the inmates of the harem, and even the servants wore clothes of good quality.⁷³ The dress of the Sultan and the *élite* consisted of a *Kulāh* — head-dress, a tunic worked in brocade and long drawers. On official occasions the Sultans wore a four-cornered head-dress (embroidered with gold thread and studded with jewels), long Tartaric gowns and *Qabā*—(which for winter was stuffed with cotton and was called *Dagla*)⁷⁴ all buckled in the middle of the body.⁷⁵ The Hindu aristocracy dressed like the Muslim aristocracy,⁷⁶ except that in place of *Kulāh* they used a turban, and in place of long drawers they wore *dhōtī* trimmed with gold lace. The Muslims all over the country dressed heavily but the Hindus were scantily dressed. "They cannot wear more clothing," says Nicolo Conti, "on account of the great heat, and for the same reason only wear Sandals, with purple and golden ties, as we see in ancient statues."⁷⁷ The south Indian kings and nobles also wore long hair. "Some tie their hair at the back of their head with a silken cord, and let it flow over their shoulders. . . ." but they shaved their beards. "The men resemble Europeans in stature and the duration of their lives".⁷⁸

There was no special uniform for any one, not even for soldiers.⁷⁹ Religious groups of the Hindus and Muslims put on various types of clothes. The orthodox Muslims wore clothes of simple material like linen; they put on a long turban or a tall *darrash* cap, loose gowns and wooden sandals. The Hindu ascetics wore a simple loin cloth or wrapped a sheet of unsewn cloth round themselves. Scholars wore the Syrian *jubbāh* and the Egyptian *dastār*.⁸⁰ The poor classes believed in reducing their clothing to a minimum. They usually went bare-headed and bare-footed. A single *dhōtī* was considered a sufficient and respectable dress. In the villages the peasants sometimes put on only a loin-cloth (*langota*) which

⁷³ Every dancing girl wore on the occasion of the 'Id festival absolutely new apparel costing 40,000 *tanās* each. T.F.S. (A), 163.

⁷⁴ T.F.S. (B), 273-74.

⁷⁵ *Alqal.*, 69, 70.

⁷⁶ J.R.A.S., 1895, 88.

⁷⁷ Nicolo Conti, 23. Also Abdur Razzaq, 17 and Nikitin, 12.

⁷⁸ Nicolo Conti, 22.

⁷⁹ W.M., 32-33.

⁸⁰ *Diwān-i-Mutakhir* quoted in K.A. Nizāmī, *Studies in Medieval Indian History*, Aligarh, 1936, 90. This dress was worn at the Firoz Shāhī Madrasā.

Bābur takes pains to describe in detail.⁵¹ That was due both to climatic conditions as well as poverty.

Of women's clothes there were usually two varieties. One consisted of a long *Chādar*, not unlike the modern *sārī*, a bodice with long sleeves and a brassiere (*angiya*) for grown up maidens and married women. The other variety, which was more popular in Uttar Pradesh, consisted of a *lahngā*, a long and loose skirt, an *angiya* and a long scarf to cover the head. Muslim women of the upper classes usually wore loose drawers, a shirt and a long scarf with the usual veil. In some places, especially in Gujarat and the Deccan, women wore shoes made of leather, ornamented with gold and silk.⁵² Besides women all over the country wore all kinds of ornaments, the rich of gold and the poor of silver. Hindu women did not put on gold ornaments below the waist.

In spite of the variety of dresses for Hindus and Muslims, a common type of Indian dress had emerged by the fifteenth century. The Hindu turban was quite popular among the Muslims of the upper classes, and the Hindu aristocracy adopted from the Muslim nobility the use of tight-fitting drawers and loose coat.⁵³ Right from the kings and the nobles at the top, down to the humblest citizens, the Muslims had become thoroughly Indianized. The costly royal dresses, the gilded and studded swords and daggers, the parasols (*chhatra*) of various colours etc. were all typically Indian paraphernalia of royal pomp and splendour. The use of rings, necklaces, ear-rings and other ornaments by men was also due to Indian influence; they are forbidden under Islamic law. Similarly, tight-fitting cloak for men and tight-fitting trousers for women (often worn underneath the *lahnga*) were adopted by the Rajputs from their Muslim neighbours.⁵⁴ It may also be pointed out that although European trousers have become common in India, the older male and female dresses have survived to this day.

Food and Drink

Like dress, food and drink are also a good index of the general standard of living of a people. In this regard in particular, the

⁵¹ B.N. (B), II, 519.

⁵² Nicolo Conti, 23.

⁵³ Ashraf, 277 and n. 2.

⁵⁴ *The Delhi Sultanate*, 609.

people of medieval India were, if not better, surely not worse off compared with our ■■■ times.

In the study of medieval historical literature, itineraries of travelers as well ■ the numerous biographical notices of saints, one is struck by the cheapness of prices of foodstuffs in the fourteenth-fifteenth century India. While cloth seems to have been scarce and costly, food was extremely cheap; cheap not only in comparison with prices prevailing today, but also with those of the times. Thus Ziyauddīn Baranī praises the cheapness in his times, giving prices of various articles of food.⁶⁴ Equally favourable is the price structure at the time of Firōz Tughlaq.⁶⁵ Due to political upheavals in the first half of the fifteenth century, food prices might have gone up a little, but no foreign or Indian writer has said so. On the other hand, 'Abdulla, the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*, bears testimony to the extreme inexpensiveness of foodstuffs during the latter half of the fifteenth century.⁶⁷

Medieval chroniclers give interesting data about the cereals, fruits, vegetables, etc. of those days. Wheat was commonly used but was "the dearest article",⁶⁸ and barley is mentioned oftener in the hagiological literature. Other cereals were peas, lintels, mash, lobiya and sesame. Rice is said to be of ■ many kinds ■ twenty-one.⁶⁹ Mahuan mentions two crops of rice in a year and says that wheat, sesame, all kinds of pulses, millet, ginger, mustard, onion, quash, hemp, brinjals and vegetables of many kinds grew in the country in abundance.⁷⁰ Wheat bread, baked (*roti*) and fried (*phūri*), was eaten with *dāl*, meat and vegetable curries. *Chapattis* were cooked in *tandūrs*,⁷¹ even now common in the Punjab, and open ovens (*chulhā*) common all over India. Other dishes were churned curd,⁷² *khajūr*,⁷³ meat and meat-soup (*āsh*).⁷⁴ *Parāṭha*, *halwā*, and *harisā*,⁷⁵ were ■■■ with the rich, *khichrī* and *sattā*.⁷⁶

⁶⁴ T.F.S. (B), 305. Elsewhere I have calculated to find that "a present day rupee would buy about two present day maunds of wheat in 'Alluddin's time'". *History of the Khalifs*, 270-71.

⁶⁵ T.F.S. (A), 293-98. ⁶⁶ T.D., Bankipore MS., 223-24.

⁶⁷ *Masālik*, E and D, III, 583; T.F.S. (B), 569. ⁶⁸ *Alqal.*, 48-49.

⁶⁹ J.R.A.S., 1895, 531. ⁷⁰ T.S.A., 58; F.F., 174.

⁷¹ R.Q., 35. ⁷² S.A., 273. ⁷³ R.Q., 10.

⁷⁴ T.F.S. (B), 316-19; S.A., 173-176; F.F., 75, 89; I.B., 38.

⁷⁵ F.F., 41; S.A., 226; I.B., 49.

with the poor. Muslims were generally meat-eaters and mostly ate "the flesh of cow and goat though they have many sheep, because they have become accustomed to it".⁹⁷ A cow for slaughtering cost only one and a half *tankās*, while fowls, pigeons and other birds were sold very cheap.⁹⁸ The Hindus as a rule were vegetarians.⁹⁹ Of the vegetables mentioned are cucumber, pumpkin, various kinds of green leaves, jack fruit (*katahal*), *harla*, turnip, carrot, asparagus, ginger, garden beet, onion, garlic, fennel and thyme.¹⁰⁰ This certainly does not exhaust the list, but these have found specific mention. Vegetables were cooked and fried with various kinds of condiments and *ghī*; and ■ if the spices were not enough to whip up the action of the stomach ■ great number of pickles (*achārs*) were added to the menu. Tamarind was commonly used and grown in abundance. *A'jūz-i-Khusrau* of Amīr Khusru and *Kitāb-ur Rohla* of Ibn Battūta are full of references to these delicacies without which Indian meals, then as now, are never complete. Pickles were prepared from green mangoes as well ■ ginger and chillies.¹⁰¹

The deserts consisted of fresh fruit, dry fruit and sweets. Dry fruits were mostly imported and so were apples, grapes, pears and pomegranates.¹⁰² Melons, green and yellow (*hurbār* and *kharbāra*), were grown in abundance.¹⁰³ Orange, citron (*uturū*), lemon (*limūn*), lime (*līm*), *jāmun*, *khīrni*, dates and figs were commonly known as also the plantain.¹⁰⁴ Sugar-cane was grown in abundance

⁹⁷ Alqal., 36.

⁹⁸ T.F.S. (B), 313. Also *Masā'il*, E and D, III, 583.

⁹⁹ Santo Stefano (in Major), 5.

¹⁰⁰ Alqal., 49-50; T.S.A., 59; S.A., 11; I.B., 17.

¹⁰¹ I.B., 16; Alqal., 50. Also see K.M. Ashraf, *Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan*, 282-83.

■ T.S.A., 50-52. Also S.A., 313. al-Qalqashindī contradicts himself when at one place he ■ that grapes were produced in India in abundance (49-50) and at another place writes: "there are few gardens but no grapes" (p.28).

'Aftī joyously mentions the fact that seven kinds of grapes were produced in the orchards of Delhi. T.F.S. (A), 295-96. Also T.F.S. (B), 569.

Ibn Battūta writes that the postal service was utilised for importing fruit. "And the fruits of Khurāsān," says he, "which are much sought after in India are often conveyed by this means." E and D, III, 588.

¹⁰² T.S.A., 51; Alqal., 49. Also T.F.S. (A), 295-96; I.B., 17.

¹⁰³ J.R.A.S., 1895, 531; T.F.S. (B), 568-70.

and Ziya'uddīn Baranī writes the Indian word for it—*ṇḍa*. Mango, then ■ now, was the most favourite fruit of India.¹⁰⁵ Sweetmeats were of many kinds, as many as sixty-five.¹⁰⁶ Some names like *reorī*, sugar-candy, *samosā*¹⁰⁷ and *halwā*¹⁰⁸ are familiar to this day.

Rain water was the chief drink of the people. It was collected in large reservoirs or tanks during the rainy season. The water of the tanks, which could hardly have been cleaned frequently and properly, and was carried in water-skins, was certainly unhygienic.¹⁰⁹ The wells¹¹⁰ posed the same problem of cleaning. Consequently rivers were considered to be the best suppliers of clean water. This may be the reason why sanctity has been attached to the Ganga through the ages. Even Sultans used to drink water from the Ganga only, and when Muhammad Tughlaq shifted his capital to Daulatabad, water from the Ganga ■ carried for him all the distance of forty days' journey to it.¹¹¹ In summer season water was cooled in earthen jugs. Iced water was a rarity even for the Sultans.¹¹² *Sharbat* ■ greatly in vogue.¹¹³ On festive occasions, or to celebrate some victory, the Sultans used to arrange for free distribution of sweets and *sharbat* among the people. Wine, prohibited by religion and disapproved by all, was drunk freely by those who had a liking for it. But the after-dinner drink was only water, and "the inhabitants of India have little taste for wine and intoxicating drinks, but content themselves with betel, an agreeable drug, the use of which is permitted without the slightest objection".¹¹⁴ In medieval chronicles it is called by its Sanskrit name *tāmbūla*.¹¹⁵ Amīr Khusrū lavishes a lot of praise on it,¹¹⁶ and so does Abdur Razzaq. Pān, says he, "gives a colour to and brightens the coun-

¹⁰⁵ F.F., 173; T.S.A., 51. Ahmad Yādgār also says that mangoes and betel were sent ■ a present to Bābur from India. T.S.A., 90.

■ Alqal., 50.

¹⁰⁶ Ibn Battūta's description of the preparation of *samosa* would make one's mouth water even today: "Minced ■ cooked with almond, walnut, pistachio, onion and spices placed inside a thin bread and fried ■ ghee." I.B., 15.

¹⁰⁷ T.F.S. (B), 318.

¹⁰⁸ I.B., 37.

¹⁰⁹ Alqal., 29.

¹¹⁰ I.B., 4.

¹¹¹ Firōz Tughlaq ■ reported to have been able to get some ice when he went to the Sirmur hills.

¹¹² T.S.A., 25.

¹¹³ *Masālik*, E and D, III, 381. Cf. Major, Nicolo Conti, 22; Nikitin, 17.

¹¹⁴ T.F.S. (B), 182. Also F.F., 163.

¹¹⁵ *Deval Rant*, 60.

tenance, causes an intoxication similar to that produced by wine, appeases hunger and excites appetite. . . . It removes the disagreeable smell from the mouth and strengthens the teeth."¹¹⁷ Pān chewing was a national habit throughout Medieval India.

Muslims used to dine together, often out of the same plate, but always on the ■■■■ board (*Dastar Khwān*). For this reason it was particularly necessary for a Muslim to know good table etiquette. Shaikh Nizāmuddīn Auliya gave a long discourse to his disciples about observing good manners while eating.¹¹⁸ Inter-dining facilitated arrangements for big dinners where ■ thousand people could eat, not only at the mansions of the nobles,¹¹⁹ but also in the Khan-qāhs of the saints.¹²⁰ The custom also certainly developed feelings of brotherhood and equality among the Muslims.

Rich Hindus, especially in the south, "used tables in the manner of Europeans with silver vessels upon them. Others ate on carpets."¹²¹ Brahmans generally did not eat meat, besides they also avoided onion and garlic.¹²² Inter-dining was neither liked nor practised by them. This attitude had permeated into other castes also. With the coming of the Muslims restrictions on inter-dining had become more than a fad.¹²³ But this custom did not affect the sense of hospitality of the Hindus which was proverbial.¹²⁴ Hindu princes gave shelter to Muslim nobles even at great risks, but since they did not inter-dine amongst themselves they did not inter-dine with the Muslims.

Bābur must have relished spicy Indian food, although he does not say so pointedly perhaps because of his unfortunate experience with Indian cooks who were bribed by Ibrāhīm Lodi's mother to poison him. To the various items of Indian food, he added a few common in his native country. Ice and iced-water were introduced in India by Bābur. Abul Fazl mentions that while the commoners

¹¹⁷ Major, *Abdur Razzāq*, 32. ¹¹⁸ S.A., 373-77.

¹¹⁹ Cf. T.F.S. (B), 116. Also I.B., 15, 65, 66, 119.

¹²⁰ R.Q., 9. ¹²¹ Nicolo Conti, *■*. ¹²² Habib, *op. cit.*, 72.

¹²³ Nikitin in Major, 17, 27.

¹²⁴ *Abdur Razzāq* says that the king of Vijāyanagar honoured him in every way and gave him presents of all kinds, but did not dine with him explaining: "Your monarchs invite an ambassador, and receive him to their table; (but) ■ you and we may not eat together, this purse full of gold is the feast we give to an ambassador". *Abdur Razzāq*, Major, 31.

used ice in summer, the great nobles used it all the year round. Bābur writes of Indian fruits as a connoisseur. From Bābur's times melons and other fruits as well as wine began to be imported in larger quantities.¹²⁵ The standard of dinners improved, so that by Akbar's time "the number of dishes served was very great, and the elaboration of the service ■■■ more remarkable".¹²⁶ Bābur did not merely complain of the things he found lacking in Hindustan; he introduced them here. From the time that he began to rule over Hindustan the standard of living of the people, at least of the rich people, began to show an upward trend.

Industry, Trade and Commerce

In the preceding pages an attempt has been made to look back and see how the various strata of society lived in the cities. As seen above, the main section of the population of the cities consisted of Government servants—high officials and nobles, civil service men and soldiers—their families, dependents and servants. Besides them, quite a large section of people were engaged in industries, trade and commerce.

In this respect the fifteenth century was a period of great activity. Muslim conquerors and rulers possessed two special qualities. They looted recklessly and they spent recklessly.¹²⁷ From the time of Muhammad Ghori onwards the loot from the temples and treasuries of Hindu kings, in other words the wealth lying frozen for decades and even centuries, was released into the market. We have seen that the kings, nobles, officers, soldiers, etc. lived a life of comfort and luxury. Trade and industry were fostered to satisfy their ever increasing demands, and money began to circulate in the market with ever greater vigour. Manufacturing centres were spread out all over the country and the State gave liberal encouragement to industry.¹²⁸ Although in the fifteenth century we do not

¹²⁵ To keep them fresh, "each melon was enclosed in a leather case, packed in ice". It was in this way that melons were transported from Central Asia to places ■ far distant as requiring ■■■ journey. M. Ilin, *Men and Mountains*, 31.

¹²⁶ Moreland, *op. cit.*, 258.

¹²⁷ T.F.S. (B), 119-20.

■ Aiqal, 51. *Masā'il*, E and D, III, 578.

hear of the *Kārkhanās* of the days of Firōz Tughlaq, yet absence of their mention does not necessarily point to their disappearance. On the other hand, there is evidence to the contrary. Both Wassāf and Marco Polo speak about the good soil and extensive cotton cultivation of Gujarat.¹²⁰ Gujarat produced good quality cloth. Similarly, according to Mahuan, ■ interpreter attached to the Chinese envoy Chang Ho who visited Bengal in 1406, five or six types of fine cotton fabrics were manufactured in Bengal alone. Besides these, Bengal specialised in manufacturing silk handkerchiefs, caps embroidered with gold, painted wares, basins, cups, guns, knives and scissors.¹²¹ Varthema (1503-8) informs us that from Bengal and Cambay silk and cotton stuffs were sent out to Persia, Tartary, Syria, Arabia and Africa.¹²² According to Barbosa (about 1518) a kind of *shash* named *sirband* and made in Bengal was liked by European ladies for their head-dress and by the Arab and Persian merchants for use as turbans.¹²³ These articles had a countrywide market also.

Indian artists and jewellers specialised in making curios and articles which were very highly priced. During the reign of Sikandar Lodi ■ artist by the name of Miān Tāh was a genius in workmanship. "He had made a single writing tablet and ■ cap out of ivory. Besides he made an ear-ring in the design of a lotus, inside which was set a fly. When the ■ put it in her ear, it seemed a bud so long as the head was kept still. As soon as the head was shaken, the bud opened up into a lotus, the fly flew out and hovered in front of the eye. When she stopped shaking the head, the fly returned to the lotus and became a bud once more. How are such marvels to be described!"¹²⁴ These artists could create such works of art because their art was handed down from generation to generation. According to Bābur, "another good thing in Hindustan is that it has unnumbered and endless workmen of every kind. There is a fixed caste for every sort of work and for everything, which had done that work or that thing from father to ■ till now".¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Yule, *Ser Marco Polo*, II, 328.

¹²⁰ J.R.A.S., 1895, 531-32.

¹²¹ *Travels of Varthema*, 212.

¹²² *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, II, 145.

¹²³ T.D. as translated in Roy's *History of the Afghans*, 121-22.

¹²⁴ B.N. (B), II, 520, also 518.

That is why men of each profession excelled in their craft. Writing about Indian workmen Bābur says: "680 men worked daily on my buildings in Agra . . . , while 1,491 stone-cutters worked ■ my buildings in Agra, Sikri, Biana, Dholpur, Gwalior and Koil.¹³⁵ In the same way there ■ numberless artisans of every sort in Hindustan,"¹³⁶ like brewers, goldsmiths, iron-smiths, tin-workers, carpenters, oilmen, barbers, jugglers, mountebanks, musicians, and still others.¹³⁷

Growth of industry necessitated facilities for the transport of merchandise from the manufacturing centres to Delhi and other important cities. Although roads and other means of communication were not very satisfactory, yet for the then traffic and volume of trade they served tolerably well. Agricultural products were transported from the fields to the markets in the cities in bullock-carts. Grain was also transported and sold by roving-merchants (*banjārās*) on mules in places which were not easily accessible. Big merchants with their merchandise generally moved only in large convoys.¹³⁸ King's officials with treasures also travelled in convoys and under proper escort.¹³⁹ Transport between cities and within the city was provided by coolies, horses, bullock-carts and *dola* or *doli*. In the days of Firōz Tughlaq hire for a bullock-cart was 4 to 5 *jītais* and 12 *jītais* for a horse. A *dola* which was carried by *Kahārs* cost half a *tankā*. In the fifteenth century Ekka and Tonga¹⁴⁰ are also mentioned, but for long journeys the horse was the common conveyance.¹⁴¹ A footman's services could be obtained for five *tankās* a month,¹⁴² and a man could travel from Delhi to Agra for one *bahlofi* which sufficed for him, his horse and his small escort during the journey.¹⁴³ A large number of people were engaged on this work. Their trade was brisk and they lived happily.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁵ As noticed before, Tīmūr ■■■ been so much impressed with Indian artists that he had taken a large number of them to his capital Samarkand.

¹³⁶ B.N. (B), II, 520.

¹³⁷ Jalai, *Padmavat*, 154, 413.

¹³⁸ T.F.S. (B), 316.

¹³⁹ I.B., 151.

¹⁴⁰ T.S.A., 24 and n., also 33.

¹⁴¹ T.S.A., 45.

¹⁴² A Sikandari (silver) *tankā* ■■■ equal to 40 (copper) *Bahlofi*. Thomas, *Chronicles*, 366.

¹⁴³ T.D., 137-38. The ■■■ of ■■■ *Zabd-ul-Tamdrīk* supports 'Abdulla regarding the cheapness of prices in Ibrāhīm Lodi's times. Elliot's *Historians*, I, 292.

¹⁴⁴ T.F.S. (A), 136.

Inland trade ■■■ in a flourishing condition throughout the fifteenth century. A treasure trove discovered in 1908 between Garha and Madan Mahal,¹⁴⁶ and consisting of coins of Muhammedan kings of Delhi, Kashmir, Gujarat, Malwa, the Bahmanī kingdom and Jaunpur, ranging from A. D. 1311 to A. D. 1553 is ■ good testimony of the constant inland trade and commerce throughout the length and breadth of the country since the treasure trove containing ■ assortment of coins from almost all important States of India was discovered at ■ place situated in the heart of the country.

Indeed from the time of 'Alāuddīn Khaljī, whether in the capital or in the major and minor cities in northern India, almost the whole of the trade was in the hands of the Hindu merchants.¹⁴⁷ They had grown rich.¹⁴⁷ According to Shams Sirāj 'Afif such was the prosperity of the people, that ■ daughter's dowry was no problem to them and they always married their girls at a very young age.¹⁴⁸ Early marriages may have been due to many other reasons also, but the statement of the chronicler is significant. He asserts that there was no family in Delhi which did not possess large quantities of ornaments,¹⁴⁹ and this finds corroboration in the description of the sack of Delhi by Timūr's men. It stands to reason that such conditions prevailed down to our period of study and beyond.

The condition of foreign trade was equally good. It was carried on both by sea and land. Since Gujarat, Bahmanī and Vijāyanagar kingdoms possessed ■ extensive coast line also, they could have both maritime as well as inland trade. In fact India had traded with foreign countries ever since ancient times. With the progress of Islam west Asian nations like Egypt, Arabia and Iran entered with ever greater zeal into the arena of the then world trade. Indian trade too received ■ impetus from this activity. Indian ports served as clearing houses for ships sailing from west Asia—Egypt, Iran and other Middle East countries—to the Far East and earned much revenue from the customs. Indian goods used to command

¹⁴⁶ Dist. Gaz., Jubbulpore, 74.

¹⁴⁷ T.F.S. (B), 316-18.

¹⁴⁸ In fact by the time of Firūz Tughlaq there was so much competition within the merchant class for obtaining licences for trade in the cantonment areas that bribery and corruption were commonly resorted to.

¹⁴⁹ T.F.S. (A), 180, also 295.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 99-100.

a ready market in foreign lands during the period under study.

Exports from India included pearls, jewels and perfumery, elephants tusks, ebony and *Ud* (an odoriferous wood), camphor, clove, nutmeg and sandal-wood. Cloth, jute, coconut, cotton, brocade and pepper also had a good market outside.¹⁵⁰ Of the imports only horses were mentioned, Arabian and Turkistan horses were in great demand here, and Wassaf writes that about 10,000 horses were imported every year.¹⁵¹ Indian rulers gained by maritime trade and so gave it every possible encouragement.¹⁵² Hindus were a sea-faring people. Nicolo Conti and Vasco da Gama write that Indian sailors guided themselves by the help of stars in the north and south and had nautical instruments of their own.¹⁵³ Gujarat kings maintained fleets also and fought naval battles.¹⁵⁴ Muslims used to go to Mecca in boats.¹⁵⁵

The main Indian sea ports were Deybul in Sindh, Cambay (Khambayat), Thana (near Bombay), and Broach in Gujarat; Choul and Dabhol in Bahmani kingdom, Mangalore in Vijayanagar kingdom, while Calicut, Quilon, and Cape Comorin were in Malabar.¹⁵⁶ Deybul was "a remarkable centre of trade" of various kinds of goods.¹⁵⁷ Calicut and Quilon had ship building and repairing yards on the west coast.¹⁵⁸ For the east coast there is the testimony of Mahuan who writes: "The rich build ships in which they carry on commerce with foreign nations".¹⁵⁹ Nicolo Conti describes the ships built by Indians and prefers them to ships built in Europe in his times.¹⁶⁰ Similar is the preference of Varthema in the sixteenth century.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁰ Nikitin, 20; Barbosa, II, 85; Islamic Culture, VII, 1933, 292-93; J.A.S.B., XXI, 261.

¹⁵¹ Wassaf, text, 529. Also Ibn Battuta, Def. and Sang., II, 371-74.

¹⁵² Ibn Battuta, Def. and Sang., III, [blank]. Also K.M. Panikkar, *Malabar and the Portuguese*, 1-25.

¹⁵³ J.R.A.S., V, 1846, 784; J.A.S.B., XXI, 563.

Also Radha Kumud Mukerjee, *A History of Indian Shipping*, 143.

¹⁵⁴ Mukerjee, 143; J.A.S.B., XXI, 553, 568. ¹⁵⁵ T.S.A., 26, 55.

¹⁵⁶ J.A.S.B., XXI, 1925, 562. Nikitin, 19-20. Also Islamic Culture, VII, 1933, 286.

¹⁵⁷ Ibn Haukal, 230; Nikitin, 20.

¹⁵⁸ I.B., 191; Abdur Razzaq, 13-20; Varthema, 152 ff.

¹⁵⁹ J.R.A.S., 1895, 530-31. ¹⁶⁰ J.A.S.B., XXI, 563.

¹⁶¹ Varthema, 152 ff.

About the close of the fifteenth century, a new race had entered the arena of overseas trade when Vasco da Gama landed on the Malabar coast in A.D. 1498. The Portuguese were quite welcome in India,¹⁴² but when they started to show their hand, Malabar resisted their encroachments. Besides, their commercial and practical activities also broke the monopoly which the Egyptians and Indians had long enjoyed in the Red Sea.¹⁴³ In 1508 Gujarat and Egypt entered into an alliance and their united fleet attacked the ships of the Portuguese¹⁴⁴ and did them great damage, but their power went on increasing till the Dutch ousted them. The commercial and colonial expansion of the Portuguese on the west coast of India is a very significant event of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, because the Portuguese were the first among the Europeans to come to a land which in course of time they were to influence in so many ways.¹⁴⁵

But, as seen above, the balance of trade was throughout in India's favour, and Indian States possessing the sea coast gained immensely. True, as Moreland suggests: "At this time Delhi was cut off from the sea coast for a century and adequate supplies (of precious metals) could be obtained (only) through the ports"¹⁴⁶ of Gujarat, Bengal and the south. But there is no evidence of "lawlessness along the roads" to which he points.¹⁴⁷ On the contrary the treasure trove discovered in Madhya Pradesh, referred to above, as well as the testimony of Bābur clearly indicate that India was carrying on trade and commerce with many foreign countries by the land route and her gains were immense. Bābur gives many interesting details about it. "On the road between Hindustan and Khorasān," writes he, "there are two great marts; the one Kabul, the other Kandahar. . . . This country lies between Hindustan and Khorasān."¹⁴⁸ It is an excellent market for com-

¹⁴² I.A., III, 100.

¹⁴³ K.M. Panikkar, *Malabar and the Portuguese*, 32.

¹⁴⁴ I.A., III, 100. Also Panikkar, 67, 69, for Zamorin's invocation of the aid of Egypt.

¹⁴⁵ For the presence of numerous Portuguese words in Indian languages, especially Urdu, see R.B. Saksena, *A History of Urdu Literature*, 5.

¹⁴⁶ Moreland, *op. cit.*, 58-69.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 68.

¹⁴⁸ Route to Kabul was from Lahore, to Kandhār from Multan. Moreland, *India at the Death of Akbar*, 219.

modities. . . . From Hindustan every year, fifteen or twenty thousand pieces of cloth are brought by caravans.¹⁶⁹ The commodities of Hindustan are slaves, white clothes, sugar-candy, refined and [redacted] sugar, drugs and spices. There [redacted] many merchants that [redacted] not satisfied with getting thirty [redacted] forty on ten (i.e. three or four hundred per cent). The productions of Khorasan, Rûm, Irâk and Chîn may all be found in Kabul, which is the very emporium of Hindustan".¹⁷⁰ According to Yahyâ Sarhindî also a large number of foreign (Khurasânî) merchants lived in Delhi and some of the best mansions in "that prosperous city" belonged to them.¹⁷¹ Surely Indian goods had [redacted] good market abroad and Indian merchants made huge profits. And since coins at this period, especially in foreign trade, "were not regarded [redacted] fixed standards of value, but rather [redacted] a form of merchandise",¹⁷² the Indian merchants obtained good quantities of gold and silver from foreign trade. In short India was eager to sell every kind of produce for these precious metals,¹⁷³ and Bâbur was impressed by the "masses of gold and silver" in this country.

Bâbur's assertion that Hindustan abounded in "masses of gold and silver" is very interesting indeed, and calls for [redacted] explanation. This conqueror of the sixteenth century might have been impressed by the funds of these precious metals here because his own country lacked them. But the question arises how was it that although [redacted] many conquerors from Mahmûd of Ghaznî to Tîmûr had carried away so much wealth out of India and so many rulers used to send out the wealth of the country for distribution among their co-religionists in Muslim countries,¹⁷⁴ the fund of gold and silver was never on the decline even when these metals were not quarried in India in any large quantities.¹⁷⁵ Perhaps a very important reason

¹⁶⁹ B.N. (L [redacted] E), 137-38. B.N. (B), I, 202, has "caravans of 10, 15 [redacted] of horses".

¹⁷⁰ B.N. (L [redacted] E), 137-38.

¹⁷¹ T.M.S., 107-8.

¹⁷² Moreland, *op. cit.*, 59.

¹⁷³ Moreland, *op. cit.*, 197-98.

¹⁷⁴ E.g. [redacted] himself [redacted] Bâbî victory at Panîpat by distributing wealth with prodigal generosity. Offerings [redacted] sent to the holy places of Mecca and Medina, "and every living [redacted] in Kabul received a silver coin". R. Williams, 139 [redacted] note; B.N. (B), II, 521-23; T.A., II, 17; Ferishta, I, 206.

¹⁷⁵ From the information given in the *Âin-i-Akbarî* "the production of gold (in the country) appears to have been negligible: the silence of the visitors

for this was that much of what the invaders carried away in loot was brought back by Indian traders and merchants through trade from the very countries to which the wealth had been carried away.

Bābur's Impressions of City Life

Bābur was not impressed with the life in the Indian cities. "Hindustan is a country," writes he, "that has few pleasures to recommend it. The people are not handsome. They have no idea of the charms of friendly society, of frankly mixing together, or of familiar intercourse. They have no genius, no comprehension of mind, no politeness of manner, no kindness or fellow-feeling, no ingenuity or mechanical invention in planning or executing their handicraft works, no skill or knowledge in design or architecture; they have no good horses, no good flesh, no grapes or musk-melons, no good fruits, no ice or cold water, no good food or bread in their bazārs, no baths or colleges, no candles, no torches, not a candle-stick".¹⁷⁸

His references to bazārs, hot-baths and colleges, leave no doubt in one's mind that in the above passage, Bābur is referring to life in the cities only, and probably in the important cities like Lahore, Delhi and Agra. Undoubtedly it is a downright condemnation of Indian life in the fifteenth-sixteenth century, and had it come from a pen other than that of Bābur's, one could have imputed motives to the author and brushed the statement aside. But Bābur is no ordinary observer, and he could not have made such statements without sufficient reason. And a little thought would explain why he has been so uncharitable in his evaluation of the life in the cities and towns of India.

Obviously he was judging things from his own standards. Bābur was no puritan. He was fond of good company, and believed in the philosophy of eat, drink and be merry. He always had a large to the south may be taken as conclusive evidence that the Mysore gold fields were not worked at that time, and Abul Fazl tells only of the metal being washed from river-sand in some parts of Northern India. . . . Silver too was obtained only in trifling quantities. Abul Fazl states that a mine existed in the province of Agra, but that it did not pay for working." Moreland, *op. cit.*, 146.

¹⁷⁸ Memoirs, Leyden and Erskine, 333. The passage in Mrs. Beveridge's translation, 318, does not bring out Bābur's reactions so clearly.

table for guests. He ate heartily off porcelain plates¹⁷⁷ and drank lustily his *arak* and the "acceptable" Ghazni wine¹⁷⁸ in the company of friends, while the story-teller (Qissā Khwān) was always at his beck and call.¹⁷⁹ Such a gay and liberal character could not be happy with the social life of the Indian cities. The Hindus did not inter-dine with the Muslims, and had scruples about inter-dining amongst themselves. During Ibrāhīm's reign nobleman was pitted against nobleman and the King was suspicious of every one. In such an atmosphere there could have been no "frank mixing together". Besides there was the tradition of not eating in the presence of the Sultan.¹⁸⁰ In these circumstances there need be no surprise if Bābur wrote: "They have no charm of friendly society, of frankly mixing together, or of familiar intercourse".

Bābur's other remarks about the Indians not having "ingenuity or mechanical invention in planning or executing their handicraft works, no skill or knowledge in design or architecture", are also not entirely without foundation. Bābur has remarked that in Hindustan even arts and crafts were the monopoly of particular castes. "Again: every artisan there is follows the trade that has come down to him from his forefather."¹⁸¹ In view of this, and in keeping with the Indian tradition, the emphasis was on preserving the old designs in art and craft rather than inventing new ones, so that the sculptural and architectural achievements of the Hindus, of which we are so proud, excelled in everything except in the novelty of vision and design. The reasons of lack of mechanical inventions have already been discussed in an earlier context. Bābur was a good judge of men and things. What he appreciated he praised unhesitatingly. He was deeply impressed with the beauty of Raja Mān Singh's fort and palace at Gwalior, and declared:

¹⁷⁷ B.N. (B), II, 541.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 551. How he once exclaimed, "Drink wine in the citadel of Kabul, and send round the cup without stopping, for it is at once a mountain and a stream, a town and a desert." B.N. (L & E), 137.

¹⁷⁹ B.N. (B), II, 460. Also Islamic Culture, XXX, 1956, 40-43.

¹⁸⁰ 'Abdulla relates that when Sikandar Lodi took his supper at night, he used to invite a number of 'Ulema to join him. Food was served before them, but they did not eat. When the Sultan had finished, the scholars took their meals home.

■ B.N. (B), II, 518.

"They are wonderful buildings, entirely hewn of stone",¹⁰² He is also all praise for the Indian stone-cutters whom he employed in large numbers to work on his buildings.¹⁰³

He was again stating a fact when he declared that in India there were no good horses, for we know that good-breed horses were imported from abroad, both in the south and in the north. Musk-melon (*Sardā*) which Bābur loved so much was then not grown in India. The *Hamām* and little canals with running water, the Mughal rulers themselves introduced in this country. True, his account of the people of India is a little biased, not because he was by conviction uncharitable towards the Indian people, but perhaps because, firstly, his stay in Hindustan was much too short to enable him to acquaint himself fully and accurately with the customs, manners, ideas and habits of the people, and secondly, everything struck him strange in "a different world". But he was certainly interested in everything he noticed in this country. He gives a detailed and minute account of the flora and fauna of Hindustan, of its mountains and rivers, of its various kinds of vegetables and fruits.¹⁰⁴

And when one reads of Bābur's jubilation at India's rains, one cannot say that he is unfair to the country. "The pleasant things of Hindustan are that it is a large country and has masses of gold and silver. Its air in the Rains is very fine. Sometimes it rains 10, 15, or 20 times a day, torrents pour down all at once and rivers flow where no water had been. While it rains and through the Rains, the air is remarkably fine, not to be surpassed for healthiness and charm."¹⁰⁵

Towards One Nation

Even a cursory study of the life of the people of medieval Hindustan would show that the food and clothes, customs and manners and even hopes and aspirations of the people were alike. And yet in India the "Hindu-Muslim problem" arose from the very inception of the Turkish rule, and there were a number of things which kept the two apart. The establishment of Muslim rule in northern

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 608.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 520.

¹⁰⁴ B.N. (B), II, 488-517.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 519.

India was through a very long process of conquest. Throughout the course of medieval history one or the other of the regions in the country was always defying the authority of the Sultanate. In this state of continual warfare atrocities and their bitter memories lingered long. As late as the fourteenth century Ziya-ud-din Barani wrote that "if they (the Hindus) do not find a mighty sovereign at their head, nor behold crowds of horse and foot with drawn swords and arrows threatening their lives and property, they fail in their allegiance, refuse payment of revenue, and excite a hundred tumults and revolts".¹⁸⁶ Obviously the Hindus were suppressed and the Muslims remained aggressive and dominating.¹⁸⁷ A generation later Ibn Battuta found the same situation.¹⁸⁸ Years later Vidyapati also wrote about the insulting attitude of the Muslims,¹⁸⁹ and the defiance of the Hindus. Such was the position in the fourteenth century on the political and military front. On the social front also the Hindus did not show any signs of degeneration. Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya admits that the Hindus were not prepared to renounce their faith under any circumstance.¹⁹⁰ The resistance of the Hindus was a cause and an effect of Muslim atrocities, and kept the two communities away from each other.

Moreover, even after two centuries of governance the Muslim ruling class was nothing more than a handful as against the vast Hindu majority. A minority is generally united and aggressive for sheer survival if for nothing else. And when it belongs to the ruling class, it is not prepared for any compromise. Thus whether of foreign extraction or of Indian, the Muslims looked down upon the "infidel" Hindus.

¹⁸⁶ T.F.S. (B), 269.

¹⁸⁷ Amir Khusrū, *Daulat Rast*, 50.

¹⁸⁸ "The Muslims dominate the infidels," he, "but the latter fortify themselves in mountains, in rocky, uneven and rugged places as well as in bamboo groves... which serve them as ramparts. Hence they cannot be subdued except by means of powerful armies." I.B., 124.

Even while he was going as the Sultan's ambassador to China, Ibn Battuta was attacked by Hindus as near Delhi as Kol (Aligarh), and his privations for more than a week show the hostility of the Hindus against the ruling race. *Ibid.*, 153-8.

¹⁸⁹ *Kirtilata*, 42-44, 70-72.

¹⁹⁰ *Faaidul Fuad*. Cited in my article *Political Condition of the Hindus under the Khalifs*. Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Patna Session, 1946, 232-37.

The inferior status accorded to the non-Muslims under Islamic law also kept the Hindus and the Muslims apart. "The Muslim state was a theocracy."¹⁰¹ Under Islamic law a non-Muslim could not be accorded full status of citizenship in the State. Only against payment of *Jazīyā*, could he receive "protection of life and exemption from military service."¹⁰² *Jazīyā* also seems to have been ■ instrument of humiliation for the non-Muslims.¹⁰³ Besides the payment of *Jazīyā* the *Zimmīs* also had to suffer certain other disabilities with regard to their mode of worship and payment of cesses and duties and because of certain sumptuary laws.¹⁰⁴ The State rested upon the support of the military class which consisted largely of the followers of the faith. They were treated as the favoured children of the State while various kinds of disabilities were imposed upon the non-Muslims. In these circumstances there is little wonder that Hindus had hardly any place in the higher offices of administration or in the formulation of its policy. It is interesting to note that even foreign adventurers were preferred just because they were Muslims to hold offices of importance and dignity which were denied to the Hindus.

But by the beginning of the fifteenth century the picture had considerably changed. The decade of decline after Fīrōz Tughlaq's death, followed by Timūr's invasion, had sapped the vitality of the Sultanate. During Timūr's invasion both the Hindus and the Muslims had fought shoulder to shoulder against the foreign foe; adversity had forged bonds of unity between them. After Timūr's invasion the Sultanate had grown weak; the Hindus had gathered strength and could not be suppressed. The rigours of Islamic law,

¹⁰¹ Tripathi, *op. cit.*, ■ This view is shared by ■ number of eminent historians like J.N. Sarkar (*History of Aurangzeb*, III, 296-97), Ishwari Prasad (*Medieval India*, 309), T.P. Hughes (*Dictionary of Islam*, 711), *Encyclopædia of Islam*, I, 959.

I. H. Qureshi (*Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi*, 42), however, does not subscribe to this view.

¹⁰² Aghnides, *Muhammadan Theories of Finance*, 399, 528.

¹⁰³ Al Mawardi, *Akhḍamur-Sultāniyyā*, 235; Tritton, *Caliphs and their Non-Muslim Subjects*, 21; Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, 119, 171, 228-245. Also Tripathi, *op. cit.*, 340.

¹⁰⁴ *Encyclopædia of Islam*, I, 958. Abu Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, French Translation, cited in Tripathi, *op. cit.*, 340; Also T.F.S., (B), 276-17, 391.

unfavourable to the Hindus, were felt only during the time of strong kings. During the fifteenth century it could not be vigorously enforced with a view to suppressing the non-Muslims. On the other hand Muslim rulers sought the support of Hindu rulers and vice versa. The kings of Jaunpur sought the help of the Hindu ruler of Gwalior and chiefs and zamindars in the east, while there were Rajas like Rai Pratap of Bhongaon and Rai Bhīm of Jammu whose advice and support the Sultans of Delhi sought. Important Hindu families in Delhi, like the Gangu Khattris, played an important role in the politics of the capital. In the latter half of the fifteenth century the Muslim ruler of Jaunpur sought and received the aid of the Baghela and Tomar Rajputs against Delhi; while some disgruntled Muslim nobles with their large forces joined hands with Rana Sāṅgā. Thus throughout the fifteenth century the power of the Hindus was rehabilitated in the Sultanate. It is not surprising, therefore, that during this period there is no mention of any forced matrimonial alliances nor of the *Jeziyā*, and collections from the Hindu rulers are just called *Māl* or *Mahsūl* or *Khidmatī*.¹⁰¹ On the other hand lands were bestowed on "large bodies of loyal Hindus and all kinds of people lived in utmost peace and tranquillity."¹⁰²

In the social sphere also the Hindus and the Muslims were coming close to each other from the beginning of the fifteenth century. The very fact that the Hindus had to live under Muslim rule made them forget the angularities of an alien law. Whether in times of war or in peace, it was the rebel, the defiant and the recalcitrant who suffered whether he was a non-Muslim or a Muslim. There does not seem to have been any interference with the day-to-day life of the common man. Thus iconoclasm and conversions were being accepted as a matter of course and the people had learnt to accept Muslim rule with all its merits and faults. Conversions, too, in a way were helping to bring the Hindus and the Muslims together. The converted Muslims always remained half-Hindus as they carried with them the legacies of their former faith. They always had their old Hindu friends and relatives with

¹⁰¹ T.M.S., 169, 173, 184, 185, 186, 188, 192, 200, 203, 206, 209, 212, 213 and corresponding passages in the other chronicles.

¹⁰² T.D. as translated in N.B. Roy's *Makhan-i-Afghān*, 111.

whom they could not break their connections.

Commoners of both the communities enjoyed and participated in the festivals of one another. Chroniclers of the century do not give details of Hindu festivals, but Chandreshwar Thakur in *Kṛtīya Rainākar* gives names of many festivals.¹⁹⁷ Important ones like Holi, Dasherā and Dīwālī certainly were enjoyed by all. Similarly there were many Muslim festivals which all sections of the people enjoyed. Shab-i-Bārāt which was probably copied from Shiva Rātri, as fireworks were common in both,¹⁹⁸ was enjoyed by both Hindus and Muslims.¹⁹⁹ Similarly the idea of Taziās in Muharram — borrowed from the Jagannath Rath Yātrā, Krishna Līlā and Mahānadi festival of south India.²⁰⁰ The celebrations in the capital city in the wake of a successful campaign were an occasion of joy for all.²⁰¹ Thus the things common between the two communities out-weighed those of differences of religion. Even in the religious sphere Sūfī saints, Hindu Yogīs and particularly the socio-religious reformers of the fifteenth century, about whom we shall study in the next chapter, helped to bring the people to understand one another, and contributed greatly towards the evolution of Indian national life. There were even reconversions of converted Muslims to Hinduism.²⁰² This was certainly not the India which Alberuni or Ibn Battūta had seen or visualised.

¹⁹⁷ *Bihar Through the Ages*, 428-29.

¹⁹⁸ Yūsuf Husain, *Islamic Culture*, XXX, 1956, 7.

¹⁹⁹ For fireworks in South India see Abdur Razzaq, 38, J.A.S.B., XXI, 1925, 574. Also T.F.S. (A), 265-67.

²⁰⁰ Ashraf, 303; Abdur Razzaq, Major, 35.

²⁰¹ T.F.S. (A), 123, 175, 252.

²⁰² Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, 170, cited in Ashraf, 194. Also Sri Ram Sharma, *Conversion and Reconversion to Hinduism*, 1-9, D.A.V. College Historical Series, No. 2, Lahore.

Chapter 13

AN AGE OF SOCIO-RELIGIOUS REFORMERS

PERHAPS THE GREATEST event of the fifteenth century was the silent revolution in Indian society brought about by a galaxy of socio-religious reformers. While themselves a product of the age the impress of which their teachings surely bore, the impact of their message on society was so great and so universal that Sikandar Lodī's religious intolerance appeared completely out of date. We shall now turn to make an appraisal of their contribution to the social and cultural life of the period under study.

About the time that Islam made its appearance in south India, a religious upheaval was in the offing there. The leader of this Hindu revivalist movement was Shankaracharya. Shankaracharya, as is well known, extinguished the last flicker of Buddhism, gave a new orientation to Hinduism, which after all had never died. But his *Advaitwād* was beyond the comprehension of the masses; it remained a subject of discussion among the intellectuals. Sankara, however, was not just a reformer; he was primarily a philosopher, a thinker and a crusader. His dynamic personality threw out sparks which illuminated the varied aspects of Hinduism. A century later Rāmānuja modified Shankara's monism, rejected the Mayawād, and laid the principle of *Viśiṣṭ Advaitwād*. Rāmānuja's monism was not so uncompromising,¹ but he and Shankara had retaught the nation the age-long idea of One Supreme Being. But in spite of the works of these masters and their followers the religion of the Hindus remained a blending of the two different tendencies, the monism of the intellectuals and the deistic polytheism of the commoners in which Brahminism, caste and Sanskrit were all preserved. All this is vouched for by Alberuni.

Philosophers and thinkers continued to appear on the country's

¹ Rāmānuja derived inspiration from ancient Hindu works, especially the *Purāṇas*, *Brahma Sūtras* and the *Bhagavad Gītā*, but Grierson thinks that he was also influenced by Islam. Tara Chand, *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture*, 108.

stage in an unbroken chain in later centuries, helping people to assuage their sufferings and to live courageously. But as with the progress of time everything changes, their outlook also gradually changed. In the fifteenth century, India saw a number of such reformers who, while deriving inspiration from the old masters, struck a new note and by their robust outlook helped the teeming millions of the country to get out of age-long superstitious traditions and march on the path of amity and progress.

The advent of Islam could not but cast its influence on the Indian thinkers. The Muslim Sūfī orders (Silsilā) were a great asset to the people in general and to the Muslims in particular. The tolerance of the Sūfī saints and their pious life earned them universal respect and helped to bring Hindus and Muslims close to each other. Some of them kept close to the Sultans, but the majority of the great amongst them would have nothing to do with the government. Both Nizāmuddīn Auliya and Shaikh Nāsiruddīn Chirāgh-i-Dehlī kept away from the government.² Their non-alignment with the State, and sometimes their open defiance of the Sultans, resulted in the rapid decline of the Chisti-Nizāmi Silsilā in the latter part of the fourteenth century. But their failure could not just leave a vacuum. It gave rise to a national religious movement in the fifteenth century throughout the country, —Maharashtra, Gujarat, Bengal, the Punjab and Uttar Pradesh. The movement first gathered strength in Maharashtra where Nāmdēva³ in the thirteenth century declared that both Hindus and Muslims were blind in insisting upon worshipping in temples and mosques, while he for His worship needed neither temple nor mosque.⁴ Such courageous denunciations were infectious and

² Shaikh Nizāmuddīn Auliya was dead against co-operation with the government, and suffered much on that account in his last days.

³ Later he migrated to the Punjab and his songs betray an influence of Punjabi. Parasuram Chaturvedi, *Sant Kāvya*, 144.

⁴ हिन्दू अंधा तुरक काना । दुहुते ज्ञानी समाना ॥
हिन्दू पूजे देहुरा । मुसलमान मसीत ॥
नामा होई सेवमा । जह् देहुरा न मसीत ॥
(The Hindu is blind; the Turk is half-blind,
But one who knows is wiser than either;
The Hindu worships in temple and
The Muslim in mosque;

Kabīr, Nānak, Chaitanya, Raidās, Garībdās and Dadū Dayāl spoke in similar strain in later centuries. Their thought was deeply influenced by the sūfism of the north on the one hand and on the other by the centuries of Hindu religious fervour in the south. Rāmānanda was its progenitor.

Rāmānanda

Rāmānanda brought to northern India the religious revival which Rāmānuja had initiated in the south. This movement was "in part a reaction against the increasing formalism of the orthodox cult, in part an assertion of the demands of the heart as against the intellectualism of the Vedānta",⁶ and was kept alive by a number of famous saints in the direct line of descent from Rāmānuja to Rāmānanda.⁷ There is a great deal of uncertainty with regard to the date of Rāmānanda's birth and death, but Kabīr being his disciple and therefore contemporary, there is good reason to believe that he lived and worked during the first half of the fifteenth century. Rāmānand was born at Prayag in a Brahman family and received his education at Allahabad and Varanasi. His first teacher was ■ Shankaran Advaitist, but later on Rāmānand became ■ disciple of Rāghavānanda, who belonged to the Sri Sampradāya of Rāmānuja. Rāmānanda travelled widely and studied deeply. At Varanasi he joined in philosophical discussions with learned Muslims and Brahmans.⁸ It ■■■ there that he passed most of his years, teaching and preaching.

There is very little literary work credited to Rāmānanda. But his ideas can be collected from the writings of his immediate followers who claim them to be his. Rāmānanda substituted the worship of Rāma, son of Dashrath, for that of Vishnū. Rāma was not *Nirguna*, but an incarnation of God, an ideally Perfect Being, *Maryādā Purushottama*. Him Rāmānanda worshipped and taught His

Nama (Namdeva) warships the ■■■ (God) (But)

Neither (in) temple nor mosque.)

⁶ Tagore, *Poems of Kabir*, Introduction, v-vi.

⁷ Rāmānuja, Dēvāchārya, Haryānanda, Rāghavānanda, Rāmānanda, Sitaram Bhagwan Prasad, *Bhakt Māla*, 264; Islamic Culture, VII, 1933, 650; Tara Chand, *op. cit.*, 143.

⁸ Macauliffe, *The Sikhs*, VI, 102; Tagore, *Poems of Kabir*, xii.

Bhakti to all without distinction of caste or creed. Thus, although born and bred in the old conservative Brahman atmosphere, he broke the shackles of orthodoxy and admitted into his new sect of Bhakts all men without distinction. His disciples came from all castes, from both sexes and even from among the Muslims. Thus he gave absolute social equality to all, even the privilege of studying the scriptures. All previous thinkers, more or less, had accepted the institution of Caste. But Rāmānanda had nothing to do with it. Indeed he may be said to have begun what is known as the religious renaissance in Medieval India.

Of the numerous disciples of Rāmānanda, a dozen illustrious ones have become famous. They are Kabīr, Bhavānanda, Ātmānanda, Sursura, Padmāvatī, Narhari, Raidās, Dhannā, Pīpā, Saīn, Sukha and the wife of Sursura. Amongst these socio-religious reformers the name of Kabīr stands above all the others.

Sant Kabīr

Kabīr's chronology and circumstances of his birth are obscure.⁸ Although it may not be possible to assign a definite date to Kabīr, A. D. 1425 as the year of his birth and A. D. 1492 or 1518 as that of his death⁹ may be taken to be quite probable.

Kabīr's parents were a Muslim couple of the weaver class, Nīrū and his wife Nīmā. According to a legend of uncertain date, he was the natural child of a Brahman widow who, to hide her shame, left him near a tank, and the weaver couple adopted him.¹⁰ Such a story might be spicy but there is probably no truth in it. That he was brought up as a Muslim and grew in the Hindu environment of Varanasi are facts which are generally accepted.¹¹ Kabīr does not

⁸ According to Macauliffe and Bhandarkar he was born in A.D. 1398, and according to Westcott and Farquhar in 1440. After discussing the various dates of his birth, Dr. Tarachand thinks 1425 is "eminently reasonable". Parasuram Chaturvedi, more or less, arrives at the same conclusion. Tara Chand, *op. cit.*, 147; Parasuram Chaturvedi, *Sant Kāvya*, 157.

⁹ *Sant Vānt Sangrah*, I, has 1518 while Sitarām Saran Bhagwan Das (*Bhakti Māla*, 474), has 1492.

¹⁰ *Kabīr Granthāvalī*, 22.

¹¹ Macauliffe, VI, 122-41; *Dabistān-i-Masūhib*, Troyer and Shea, II, 186-91; Ain, Jarret, II, 171-72.

to have received any formal education, perhaps he even did not know to read and write, but he possessed an inquiring mind¹² and living at Varanasi he did, he became conversant with the religious literature of the Hindus. He also knew quite a bit about Islam, the religion of his parents, and about Hinduism. As he grew up his thirst for religious knowledge increased. Rāmānanda accepted him as a disciple and initiated Kabir into a deeper knowledge of Hindu philosophy and religion.

Kabir took to his father's profession of weaving. He wove his cloth and while he did so he sang his ideas in songs. Some songs he wove in perfect poetry as he did his cloth, but most of the others are broken in language and faulty in grammar. He never used paper or pen, but communicated his compositions orally. The headquarters of the Kabir Panthis at Kabir Chaura in Varanasi possess a collection of twenty-one books of the master. The language of these works is simple. He was no finished philosopher but only a mystic poet. He preached his message in the form of Sakhis, Shabdas, Rāmānis, etc. Sakhis mostly deal with social conduct; while Shabdas and Rāmānis elaborate religious and philosophical principles, though there is no deliberate attempt at such separation.¹³

Kabir was a great social and religious reformer. His mission in life was to fight against all prevailing superstition—blind faith in the word of scriptures, pilgrimages, idol-worship, ritualism incarnations and the like. He fought against the caste-system and against all intolerance. But his approach to all these problems was of a positive character. He wanted to unite the Hindus and Muslims and wipe out all distinctions of caste and creed. He preached a religion of universal brotherhood. He was convinced that the essence of Hinduism and Islam was the same. He selected from both the religions their common elements and tried to demonstrate that the orthodox Pandits and 'Ulema were ignorant of the basic truth of the two creeds. While propounding his ideas he was partial to neither.

According to Kabir there is only one God, although He is called by different names—Rām, Rahīm, Allāh, Khudā, Hari, Govind and the like.¹⁴ He conceived of Him as attributeless (Nirguna),

¹² *Kabir Granthāvalī*, 34, 35.

¹³ *Kabir Granthāvalī*, 48.

¹⁴ *Kabir Granthāvalī*, 34.

who has neither shape nor form. By this Kabir escaped the excessive emotionalism which resulted from the worship of anthropomorphic personality, seen, for example, in the exuberance of Krishna worship. But then he also avoided the dry-as-dust conclusions of pure monism, and apprehended Him as the supreme object of love.¹⁶

Kabir thinks that God and soul are identical and there is thus no distinction between the Absolute and the devotee. He often compares the relationship between them as that of the sea and the waves¹⁶ or the ice and water.¹⁷ The destiny of the individual is the merging of the part (soul) with the whole (God) or the realisation of union with Him. The path of this spiritual endeavour is long and difficult, but not so difficult as to frighten the devotee. Thus while love directed towards the Nirguna takes a mystic form,¹⁸ it is also direct and warm, like the wife's passionate love for her husband, the longing of the bride for the bridegroom and the devotion of a faithful servant for his master.¹⁹ In his characterisation of this love Kabir combines the Vaishnava concept of Bhakti with the Sūfī devotion to Allāh.

God being Absolute, belief in idols and Avatārs is gross superstition. "The images are all lifeless, they cannot speak: I know for I have cried aloud to them." So is also the case with temples and mosques, K'abā and Kashi. Like Nāmdēva, Kabir declares: "The Hindu resorts to the temple and the Musalman to the mosque, but Kabir goes to the place where both are known."²⁰ Kabir fails to understand how there can be — God for Hindus and another for Muslims. "If you say that I am a Hindu then it is not true, nor am I a Musalman . . . Mecca has verily become Kashi, and Rām has become Rahīm."²¹

¹⁶ Tara Chand, 134.

¹⁷ K. M. Sen, *Kabir*, II, 74.

¹⁸ पाणी ही ते हिम भया । हिम हवै भया बिलाई ॥
जो कुछ था सोई भया । अब कुछ कहा न जाई ॥

(The water coagulates ~~now~~ ~~nothing~~
And the snow melts into water;
It (only) changes into itself,
Now nothing (what else) can be said.)

Kabir Granthāvalī, 35.

¹⁹ *Kabir Sākhī Sār*, 40-42.

²⁰ Tagore, *Poems of Kabir*, XXIX.

²¹ Yugalānand, *Kabir Sahib Ki Sākhī*, Madhya Ka Anga.

²² *Ibid.*

Union with God can be realised; but not just through inspiration and intense devotion (Bhakti). It is of the utmost importance to seek a spiritual preceptor (Gurū), for a devotee faces many temptations and doubts in his Sādhana, and Māyā is ever intent ■ attracting man away from God.²² Great caution is needed in the selection of Gurū. A wrong choice would only lead both the Gurū and the disciple into the well of darkness.²³ A Gurū is that Sadhū who has already realised union with Him and can inspire faith in his disciple. But once the Gurū is selected, confidence in him should be unconditional. "Consider the Gurū ■ Govind (God)",²⁴ nay he is even superior to Him, for "If Harī becomes angry, Gurū is the refuge, but if Gurū is angry then there is no place to go to."²⁵ In the *panth* of Kabir, Gurū holds the same position as Pir in any Sūfi order.

Under the guidance of the Gurū, by yogic exercises and Sādhana, the disciple would gain complete control of his passion and desire. By abandoning anger and pride and by acquiring humility, poverty and patience he would experience that self-effacement in which he would realise his identity with Him. One who truly seeks His protection (*sharana*) is never disappointed, for He is merciful (Dayālū and Meharbān).

For union with Him there ■ no need to completely retire from the world or to flee to the jungle. Kabir, who felt that he had realised union with Him, himself never left the world. He lived the life of a house-holder, stuck to his profession and earned an income.

■ Kabir Sāhity Sār, 25-32.

■ जाका गुरु भी अंधला । बेला जरा निरय ॥
अंधे अंधा ठेलिया । दुम्बू रूप पईत ॥

(One whose Gurū is blind, (ignorant),
While the disciple is completely blind (ignorant),
The blind leads the blind and
Both fall into the well.)

Kabir Granthāvalī, 2.

²² Yugalānand, *op. cit.*, Guru Deva Ka Anga.

²³ हरि कठ गुरु ठौर है । गुरु रुटे नहि ठौर ॥
(When Harī (God) gets annoyed
There is refuge with ■ Gurū;
But when the Gurū gets annoyed,
There ■ no refuge.)

Kabir Granthāvalī, also Yugalānand, 6.

He advocated the same simple recipe for others. One should live in the world, but should have no attachment to worldly things ■ they were *Māyā*.

Thus Kabīr preached a universal religion, and showed a path which everybody could tread. But people, he found, were enveloped in gross superstition. There were distinctions of high and low and differences between Hindus and Muslims. Therefore he fervently appealed to them to give up their superstitious beliefs and dogmas, and take to the path of universal brotherhood. He asked the Hindus to give up all externalia of religion—worship of idols, ritualism, belief in distinctions of caste and creed, emphasis on scriptures and incarnations. He asked the Muslims to give up their arrogance and blind faith in "one Prophet and his book". Pilgrimages to Mecca, fasts and regulated prayers were meaningless. To both Hindus and Muslims he taught reverence for the living creatures, to abstain from violence and bloodshed, to give up all pride and live like brothers. Kabīr was perhaps the first socio-religious reformer who clearly and repeatedly declared that Hindus and Musalmans were the children of the one Supreme Being. They must live as one. Their differences were the product of their ignorance.

In his attacks on the ignorant and superstitious, Kabīr was uncompromising. Day in and day out this weaver, sitting in front of his lowly cottage weaving his cloth (so the pictures depict him), would castigate the Hindus and the Muslims, sparing none. The unusual in Kabīr attracted the people towards him. The story of his birth was unusual, his education was unusual—he was ■ unlettered philosopher—his way of life was unusual—he was both an ascetic and a householder, ■ saint who earned his living by work—his approach to the problems of society was unusual, he criticised all. People listened to him because he spoke the truth, bare and stark. But some of them were naturally annoyed at his scathing criticism of everything they believed or did. The Muslims could hardly tolerate being told that their religion was not superior to others, and their fasts and pilgrimages had no intrinsic worth. The Hindus could not always bear to hear that their temples and gods, the *Vedas* and *Shāstras*, their caste and *Varna* were all false. In the view of the orthodox, whether Hindu or Muslim, Kabīr was plainly a heretic. Some of the Mullās and Pandits lodged

a protest with Sikandar Lodī against the activities of Kabīr. This was about the year 1495 when Sikandar Lodī was completing his subjugation of the eastern region. The Sultan summoned Kabīr to his presence, but was averse to punishing this well-meaning old man of more than sixty years of age. Moreover, there appeared nothing blasphemous in the simple teachings of a poor weaver. Sikandar, therefore, only sent him into temporary exile, from Varanasi to Maghār.

In spite of the malicious opposition from the orthodox people, Kabīr's movement became a living force in the fifteenth century and after. For the lower caste Hindus, he was like Christ. He saved them from degradation and resuscitated Hindu society by reclaiming them to it. Kabīr not only succeeded fairly well in his mission, but he also inspired many contemporary and later thinkers who kept his movement alive and led society forward on the path shown by him.

Other Disciples Of Rāmānanda

Of the disciples of Rāmānanda, Kabīr undoubtedly occupies the first place. But Dhannā, Pīpā, Sain and Raidās also delivered the same broad-based message though in an humbler way. Some of the hymns of the first three are preserved in the *Adigrantha* of the Sikhs, while Raidās's teachings have been published separately.

Dhannā was born in the village of Dhuan, in Tank, Rajputana.²⁰ He was a simple peasant and taught Bhakti to the people through his simple songs. Pīpā was the Raja of Gagraungarh, but being of saintly temperament, became the disciple of Rāmānanda. "Pīpāji Ki Bānī" has not been published, but a hymn in the *Adigrantha* shows the same tendency which is found in other contemporary saints, that is, worship must be internal and discipleship of Gurū helps one to attain God. Sain was a barber. His hymns are both in Marathi and Hindi, which shows that his message influenced both the south and the north. Ravidās or Raidās belonged to Varanasi.

²⁰ He was born in A.D. 1472 according to Macauliffe and in A.D. 1415 according to Tarachand; but since he was a disciple of Rāmānanda the latter date seems to be more probable. Tarachand, 178; Also *Sant Kavya*, 128.

He was a worker in leather and the people of his family used to do the work of removing carcasses.²⁷ It was in consonance with the spirit of the fifteenth century that such a very low caste reformist came to be known as a saint (*sant*). It is said that Jhūli Rāni, a princess of Mewar, became his disciple. His poems, retailed in stray publications, show his heart completely saturated with the love of God.

Kabir and his contemporaries (including his son Sant Kamāl) influenced the life and thought of the people in Uttar Pradesh, Rajputana, northern Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat, and perhaps the south also. Nānak, another mighty mind, created a similar stir in the Punjab.

Gurū Nānak

Nānak met Kabir when he was about twenty-seven years of age.²⁸ This must have been nearabout the last decade of the fifteenth century when Kabir was more than sixty-five and his fame had spread far and wide. There is no doubt that Nānak learnt much from Kabir, for in the *Adigranth*, the religious Book of the Sikhs, there are many lines composed by Kabir.

Nānak's chronology is fairly certain and exact. He was born on the full-moon day of Kārtik, 26 November, 1469 at the village of Talwandi, situated on the banks of the Ravi, in the district of Gujranwalla. He appears to have acquired some knowledge of Hindi and Persian, but was averse to any deep desire for learning. He tried on many odd jobs like agriculture and shop-keeping but without much success.

At the age of eighteen Nānak was married to a Khattri girl Sulākhin, and by her he had two sons, Sri Chand and Lakshmi Chand.²⁹ But he was neither attached to his family nor to his job. He longed to satisfy his spiritual hunger—an innate thirst to know the Truth. At last when he was about thirty years he gave up his home and his job and became a Sanyasi. He set out to meet Sadhus

²⁷ *Sant Kavya*, 210.

²⁸ Westcott, *Kabir* [*Kabir Panth; Kabir Granthāvalī*,]

²⁹ Sri Chand later founded the order of [] who have a number of *Akhāras* all over the Punjab.

and saints and to gather experience. On his wanderings he ■ accompanied by Bhai Bālā, his companion from childhood and Bhai Mardānū, a Muhammadan Rabābī or minstrel who used to play on the harp when the master meditated. Nānak's common recitation in the praise of the Creator was "Tūhī Nirankār, Kirtār,—Nānak Bandā Terā". With regard to Nānak's travels, it is difficult to speak with precision, but he appears to have visited most of the important places in India, Ceylon, Arabia and Iran. He seems to have visited Mecca and Medina in the garb of a Muhammedan faqīr.³⁰ All kinds of miraculous stories are related in connection with these travels. In 1504 he became the Gurū of the Sikhs (*Shishya*, disciples) and for the next thirty-four years he preached his message. During these years also he travelled, and most of the places he visited in the Punjab in course of time became centres of pilgrimage.³¹ He breathed his last in 1538 in his home-town at the ripe age of seventy. The Muslims erected a tomb and the Hindus a shrine in his memory. Both the tomb and the *samādhi* have since been swept away by the waters of the Ravi.

Nānak regarded himself as the prophet of God, and had "received from His door-step" the message which he delivered.³² His mission was the unification of the Hindus and the Muslims. Punjab was so situated ■ always to bear the brunt ■ the attack of invaders from the north-west. During the invasion of Tīmūr it had suffered terribly. All along the fifteenth century it was in turmoil; foreign invaders and local rebels had brought about untold misery to the fair land of the Five Rivers. In Nānak's days the pressure of Islam on the people of the Punjab ■ daily increasing. There seemed to be no end to the conflict between the Hindus and the Muslims. Nānak realised that in order to heal the wounds of society, it was necessary to end the conflict of religions. He strove towards that end. That was the mission of his life.

³⁰ Ind. Ant., III, 1874, 298.

³¹ *Kiara Sahib*, where he used to ■ in youth grazing cattle; *Mal Sahib*, where he spent the money given by his father for trade on feeding the Sadhus and thus did Kharā Saudā or true business; *Sant Ghat* and *Baba Ki Bir* where he used to bathe and sit ■ ■ Nadi; *Rori Sahib*, where he slept at Aminabad; *Panja Sahib* in Hasan Abdāl near Rawalpindi—and many others. Ind. Ant., III, 1874, 295-99.

■ Khazān Singh, *The History and Philosophy of Sikhism*, II, 350.

His *Janam Sākhī* (biographies) declare that the first words that the Gurū uttered after his revelation were: "There is no Hindu, there is no Musalman."²² This clearly indicates that it was Nānak's settled intention to do away with differences between the two by instituting a third course which should supersede both of them. Nānak's message is similar to that of Kabīr's, for both were trying to cure the same diseases of the same society.

The chief point of Nānak's teaching was unquestionably the unity of God. The Sikh Gurū conceived of God as One, Nirguna (attributeless) and Nirākār (formless). He "is inaccessible, fathomless and is exalted above all."²³ Once this Absolute Supreme could be understood there was to be no difference between His creatures, Hindus or Muslims, and there was to be no quarrel about His name. Nānak himself uses the names of Hari, Rām, Govind, Brahma, Allāh, Khudā, Sāhab, Parmēshwara, with absolute freedom. By emphasising the Majesty of the Absolute Supreme the Gurū dealt a blow to the Hindu pantheon of deities. In the *Ādi Granth*²⁴ it is clearly stated that "the cause of causes is the Creator."²⁵

Man's soul is held by Nānak to be a ray of light emanating from the Light Divine.²⁷ But being enmeshed in Māyā, men are deluded into egotism and think of their existence as apart from His. This delusion prevents the pure soul from freeing itself from the matter, and hence the long chain of painful births and deaths, of transmigration of the soul. To remove this delusion and to return and merge with the Light Divine should be the aim of man. It is like *fanā* of the Sūfis and *Nirvāṇa* of the Buddhists. This can be achieved by constant remembrance of His name (*Smarana*), ardent, constant, sincere *smarana*, be it of any name of God. One who is constantly lost in love of God is in harmony with Him and His creations. He loves and serves all, and hates none. Nānak laid great emphasis on right action and humility of temper.

It is by complete surrender to Him that self-realisation is possible,

²² T. P. Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, 586.

²³ Macauliffe, I, 363.

²⁴ *Ādi Granth* of Gurū Nānak is distinguished by the *Guru Granth* finalised by Gurū Govind Singh.

²⁵ Dr. Trumpp's translation of the *Ādi Granth*, 474; Hughes, 590.

²⁷ Macauliffe, *op. cit.*, II, 171.

not by pilgrimages, idol-worship, practice of austerities, self-torture or mechanical recitation of this or that formulae. He strongly condemns the superstitions of both Hindus and Muslims. "Until thou art saturated with the True name, nothing would avail thee," says Nānak.³⁹ He attacks the caste-system of the Hindus and declares himself to be "with those who ■ low-born among the lowly."⁴⁰ To the Musalmans his advice is: "Make kindness thy mosque, sincerity thy prayer-carpet, what is just and lawful thy Qurān".⁴⁰ Like Kabīr, Gurū Nānak is never tired of praising the good and attacking the evil. He threatens sinners with dire punishments, but if they chose to walk along the path of virtue, the mercy of God was always there for He was ever ready to help.

Self-realisation was to be achieved amidst the tumult and turmoil of life. Sachkhand (the kingdom of Heaven) was to be earned within this world. Renunciation of the world was tantamount to fleeing from the battle of life. The Gurū knew that after all people have to live in the world and work in their professions, and a religion of renunciation could not suit them.⁴¹ He, therefore, advocated ■ middle path between extreme asceticism and free satisfaction of the senses. Like Kabīr, Gurū Nānak also thought that a preceptor (Gurū) was essential for one who sought self-realisation.

As time passed Sikhism became a full-fledged religion almost of the pattern of Islam. It had a Prophet (Gurū Nānak), a Book

■ He exclaims:

"Hadst thou the eighteen *Puranas* with thee,
Couldst thou recite the four *Vedas*,
Didst thou bathe on holy days and give alms according to man's castes,
Didst thou fast and perform religious ceremonies day and night,
Wast thou a Qāsi, ■ Mullā, or a Shaikh,
A Jogī, a Jāngam, didst thou wear an ochre-coloured dress
Or didst thou perform the duties of a house-holder,
Without knowing God, Death would bind ■ take all ■ away."

Also,

"He who worshippeth stones, visiteth places of pilgrimage, dwelleth in forests,

And renounceth the world, wandereth and wavereth,

How can his filthy mind become pure."

Macauliffe, I, 133, 139.

³⁹ Macauliffe, I, 186.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 1, 38.

⁴¹ Tarachand, 174; Macauliffe, I, 13.

(*Adi Granth*; later the *Gurū Granth Sahab*) and a Church (Gurud-wārā for the *Sangat*). Amritsar became the Mecca of the Sikhs (during the time of Gurū Rām Das) and they paid a religious tax (started by Gurū Arjun) of the type of *Zakāt*. Kabir had only attacked the evils of the society, but in Nānak's teachings there were seeds of a definite religion. Nānak even otherwise succeeded better while Kabir caused offence by his airs of superiority. Nānak's pure and serene way of life, his characteristic humility and his forbearance won for him the love of the people. He could prove what he said, and his "miraculous" acts made many staunch Hindus and Muslims his sincere disciples.⁴² In the course of the next two centuries political persecution changed Sikhism into a militant religion, but in essentials it continued to have the indelible impress of Gurū Nānak's teachings. During the period of our study Sikhism was distinguished by its stern ethical tone and puritanism from similar movements in the fifteenth century.

It has been noted that Kabir and Nānak and other minor contemporary reformers derived inspiration from Sūfic lore, Hindu religious books, and teachings of earlier masters. Nānak learnt much from Kabir. Kabir was a disciple of Rāmānanda and Rāmānanda belonged to the school of Rāmānuja. There is consequently an unmistakable impress of the ideas of Rāmānuja on the teachings of Kabir and Nānak.

Both Kabir and Nānak, while conceiving of God as formless (Nirguna, Nirākār), apprehended Him as the supreme object of love. To Rāmānuja the individual soul, made by God out of his essence, returned to its maker and lived in full communion with him, although ever remaining distinct (*Viśiṣṭādvaita*). Kabir considered that the destiny of the individual is the merging of the part (soul) with the whole (God). Similarly Nānak held man's soul to be a ray of light emanating from the Light Divine. To Rāmānuja Bhakti-yoga was the greatest yoga.⁴³ To Kabir and Nānak and other *sants* of the fifteenth century also Bhakti was the surest way to redemption. Thus Rāmānuja, Kabir and Nānak all believed in Bhakti as the only means of salvation.

Again, just as Rāmānuja had advocated not only unconditional

⁴² *Dictionary of Islam*, 586-87.

⁴³ A. L. Basham, *The Wonder that is India*, 332. Tarachand, *op. cit.*, 102.

trust in the Gurū but even his adoration (*āchāryā bhīmāna—yoga*), ■ did Kabīr and Nānak give a divine status to the Gurū. Even in the sphere of social reform Rāmānuja had shown the way. He had admitted into the great temple of Srirangam, where he taught and preached, Shudras and the out-caste, although with certain restrictions. For them he had advocated *prapatti* (self-surrender). Kabīr and Nānak recognized no distinction of caste, creed or religion and advocated the path of Bhakti and *prapatti* for all. Thus the teachings of Kabīr and Nānak bore the stamp of Rāmānuja's philosophy and thought.

Vallabhacharya

Kabīr and Nānak had preached the path of Bhakti for self-realisation. They conceived God ■ Nirguna (attributeless) and Nirākār (formless). Love for Him took ■ mystic, Sūfī form. Their influence was greatest in the eastern Uttar Pradesh and the Punjab, but in the fifteenth century the whole of northern India was experiencing a religious ferment. In Bengal and western Uttar Pradesh also Chaitanya and Vallabhacharya helped give rise to a similar religious stir. But their love took the shape of an emotional, even erotic form. Though the two great sects of Chaitanya and Vallabhacharya have different geographical spheres, both adore Krishna as a child ■ young man. It is not the Nirguna Deity that is worshipped but a Saguna (anthropomorphic). Their almost simultaneous appearance in Bengal and Central India represents an unusually strong current of similar ideas and sentiments⁴⁴ throughout the country.

Vallabhacharya was the son of Lakshmana Bhatt, a Telingana Brahman, and was born at Varanasi in A. D. 1479. At twelve, Vallabha had already discovered a new Vaishnava religion, and started on a pilgrimage to preach it. He is said to have gone to the court of Krishna Dēvarāya of Vijayanagar, where he defeated some Shaiva pandits in discussion. It is said that while at Vrindāvan, he was visited by Krishna in person.

Vallabha insisted on the "complete identity of both soul and world with the Supreme Spirit". His monism was known as *Suddha-*

⁴⁴ Elliot, *Hinduism*, II.

advaita or "Pure Non-Duality". According to him Bhakti was both the means and the end; it is given by God; it comes by His grace. He conceived of Brahma ■ the material cause of the world, and believed that through ■ grace salvation could be achieved. His was the *Pushkī-Mārg*, ■ path of salvation through His Grace (*anugraha*). *Pushkī* in its highest form enabled one to attain God; in the ordinary way it enabled ■ to attain the objects of one's desires. Vallabha regarded the teacher ■ earth as divine, receiving divine honours.

Vallabha differed from Rāmānuja in so far that he believed in *Suddha-advaita*, recognising ■ distinction between Soul and God—Soul was not His part but Him. Otherwise he also followed in the footsteps of the twelfth century master. Rāmānuja's advocacy of intense devotion to Vishnu is fully realised in Vallabh's faith. According to both, Gurū was comparable to God. Above all, to both of them, God was full of grace, and love for His creation.

In essence Vallabh's teachings were good, in practice they became "wordly". Eliot thinks that with Vallabh the vision which is generally directed Godwards and forgets the flesh, turned earthwards and forgot God. The literature of the Vallabhacharīs repeatedly states that the Gurū is the same as the deity, and often the worship tended to be licentious when women worshipped the deity in the form of the priest. In the sixteenth century the Rādhā-Vallabhis, who gave pre-eminence to Rādhā, made the worship a farce bordering ■ obscenity. In the words of Monier Williams,⁴⁵ "Vallabhacharyaism became in its degenerate form the Epicureanism of the East".⁴⁶

In spite of the few weaknesses that had crept in the movement of Vallabhacharya, there ■ many redeeming features in it. Vallabha advocated the worship of ■ Gopāl or the Child Lord. The idea is foreign to the western mind, but in India the worship of Bāḥ Bhagwān has an important place. Vallabha sect also attracted men of all castes and creeds including Muhammadans.

⁴⁵ Also cited in *An Advanced History of India* (Macmillan, 1953), 404.

⁴⁶ Today the Māhārāj of the Nathdwārā temple in Rajasthan is the chief of the Vallabhi sect.

Chaitanya

The emotional land of Bengal is perhaps the natural ground for the worship of Krishna as the God of love. Here flourished Jayadēva (twelfth century),⁴⁷ Chandi Dās (A. D. 1417-78) and Vidyāpati (A. D. 1433-81). Their passionate poetry had prepared the way for the passionate lover-beloved Chaitanya. Since Chaitanya was undoubtedly a child of his Age, a word about the social life of those times would not be out of place here.

Muslim conquest was not without its blessings in Bengal. There, ■ elsewhere, developed an understanding between Hindus and Muslims. Hindus offered sweets at Muslims shrines; consulted and kept copies of the Quran. Musalmans responded with similar acts.⁴⁸ Vidyāpati dedicated his songs to Nāsir Shāh, and Sultan Husain Shāh of Gauda is supposed to have been the originator of the cult of Satya Pīr to which both Hindus and Muslims were attracted. But the state of Hindu religion was far from satisfactory. On the one hand there was the worship of Chandi with all its concomitant sacrifices and tantrism of a debased and sensuous nature, ■ the other society was suffering from the harmful pride of pedigree, caste and religious narrowness. Everywhere in Bengal the power of the Brahmans was in the ascendant, and the lower strata of society groaned under the tyranny of the higher.⁴⁹

Such was the background in which Chaitanya appeared on the scene.⁵⁰ He was born at Nawadwīp or Nadia in March, 1486, to Jagannath Misra and his wife Sachi Debi. Nimai (for that was Chaitanya's pet name in childhood) was a handsome child with expressive eyes and sonorous voice.⁵¹

Born in a high class Brahman family, Nimai shaped well as a boy and was renowned for his love of learning. When eighteen he got married and settled down as a teacher in a *tol* (school) established by himself ■ the banks of the Bhagīrathī. Nadia at this time was

■ The author of *Gita Govind*.

⁴⁷ Tarachand, 217.

⁴⁸ D. C. Sen, *History of Bengali Language and Literature*, 413-14.

⁴⁹ J. N. Sarkar, *Chaitanya's Pilgrimages and Teachings*, 226.

⁵¹ Ind. Ant., II, 1873. 2; Havell, *Aryan Rule in India*, 415 n. and 30.

a famous educational centre.⁵³ The chief interest of Nādia society was debates on philosophical subjects, and Chaitanya is said to have defeated many famous scholars of the day in intellectual bouts. Soon the call from within did not let him continue in his profession for long. Even as a boy he seems to have been eccentric and used to swoon at the name of Krishna. He left his school and went to east Bengal, where he added to his scholastic reputation. At Gaya he met Ishwar Purī, a Vaishnav devotee and preacher, who initiated him into the Bhakti cult.

When he returned home, at twenty-three, he was a completely changed man. He was now known as Chaitanya, which literally means "the soul, the intellect". He was saturated with love of Krishna. He felt that Krishna, the everlasting Being and Radha, the ceaseless Becoming, had attained a mystical identity with him. Everything Krishna did, Chaitanya must do too. Thus *Sankhīrtans* (singing in worship) were held and dances done in which Chaitanya and Murārī Gupta and many others used to swoon and foam at the mouth. The new religionists met with some opposition and a good deal of mockery.⁵⁴ But ultimately all opposition died out. Chaitanya's sincere and emotional *Kīrtans* won him hundreds of adherents from all sections of society, castes, creeds and religions. Their common meeting ground was the *nāma Sankhīrtan* (singing the name of the Lord).

At the age of twenty-five Chaitanya took to Sanyās. Like any other Sanyāsī he started on a round of travels. He first went to the shrine of Jagannāth at Puri and thence for six years he roamed all over India preaching Vaishnavism or the cult of Bhakti. In the north he went up to Vrindāvan, passing through Varanasi and Prayag, and in the south up to Rameshwaram. During his travels he came in touch with many Faqīrs and Sādhūs. He was impressed by the simple and democratic ideas of the Muslim Saints.⁵⁵ At Kashi he won over the Vedantic Sanyāsī Prakāśhānand Saraswati to his doctrine of Bhakti. On his way from Vrindāvan to Kashi,

⁵³ D. C. Sen, *op. cit.*, 420.

⁵⁴ Ind. Ant., II, 1873, 3.

⁵⁵ As indicated in his biography *Chaitanya Charitamrita* of Krishna Dās Kavirāj, translated by J. N. Sarkar. Also Jadu Bhattacharya, *Hindu Castes and Sects*, 464.

he converted by his love ten "Pathan Vairāgis".⁸⁴ He returned at last to Puri where he passed the remaining eighteen years of his life. He died in 1534 at the early age of forty-eight. After him, his work was carried on by the Goswamis, ■ order of the Vaishnava monks founded by him.

Chaitanya's leading principle is Bhakti ■ devotion. Like all Vedāntists he speaks of Brahma, ■ Supreme Being, with the highest esteem, but his Brahma ■ possessed of attributes which are best manifested in the charming personality of Sri Krishna. His God ■ ■ personal being, full of grace and love for His creation and endowed with qualities of unequalled excellence. He calls Him Bhagwān or more frequently Hārī. Krishna is a loving God. He inspires love and feels affection for His devotees. According to Chaitanya, Bhakti and love are best exemplified and illustrated by the mutual love of Rādhā and Krishna. In his ideas Chaitanya ■ to have been deeply influenced by the *Bhagavad Gītā*, the *Bhāgavat Purāna* and the teachings of Rāmānuja.

For Chaitanya to strive to be near Him and to completely surrender to Him (*prapatti*) was the way to salvation. In relation to God, reason was useless. The Bhakta passes through five successive stages in his goal of salvation. The first is *Santā*, or resigned contemplation; the second *Dasya* or service and servitude to Him. In the third the devotee reaches a stage of *Sākhyā* or friendship which warms into the fourth stage of *Vātsalya* or love like that of a child for its parents. The last stage is of *Mādhurya*, earnest and all-engrossing love, love of ■ woman for her lover. Chaitanya's biographers claim that he had experienced this last stage of love and combined in himself the unique blending of the two aspects of God—God the lover and God the beloved—represented in Vaishnava literature as Krishna and Radha.

Chaitanya was an optimist. Existence to him is not *Māyā*. In existence there is no misery, there is a definite and positive joy. It is the play (*Līlā*) and the playground of God. Like Rāmānuja, Chaitanya also felt that "God needed man ■ man needed God".⁸⁵

■ *Chaitanya Charitamrita*, Sarkar's translation, 226. Also "His Pilgrimage in Upper India"—*Amrit Bazar Patrika*, Allahabad, Supplement, March 16, 1957.

■ Basham, *op. cit.*, 332.

Each and every devotee has a place in this *Līlā*. Viewed from this angle, the world is an abode of His play and we are participants in His Divine *Līlā*. Once the devotee feels that everything is a part of His sport, he will actually experience the joy of Krishna's company. His attachment to worldly objects would slacken and his soul will be liberated. Chaitanya thought that even repetition of His name with sincerity and devotion was enough for the people of Kalyug (Kālī Age). This is exactly what Nānak⁹⁷ and Rāmānuja also said.

Like Rāmānuja and the thinkers of the fifteenth century, Chaitanya gives the Gurū ■ very prominent place in the life of the devotee. "If ■ creature adores Krishna and serves his Gurū, he is released from the meshes of illusion and attains to Krishna's feet."⁹⁸ He condemns the ritualistic system of the Brahmans. He is against all distinctions of caste. He accepted disciples from all classes of people. From king Pratap Rudra of Orissa to villains and miscreants like Jagai Madhai and Chalgöpāl, all sorts of people were his disciples and their spiritual regeneration was exemplary. Of his Muslim disciples the names of Rūp, Haridās and Sanatan are prominent.

Again like other contemporary thinkers, Chaitanya was against asceticism or renunciation. Though he became a Sanyāsī himself, he did not like people to renounce their duties in the world. In fact he induced Nityānand, a mendicant, to give up Sanyās, marry and be a house-holder. He also tried his best to persuade Raghunāth, the only heir of a rich family, not to become ■ Sanyāsī, and only initiated him into Sanyās after giving a number of strict, gruelling tests.

Thus by attacking the evils of the day and in giving a simple religion of Bhakti to the people, Chaitanya contributed much to the regeneration of the Bengali people. His religion of emotional love, unlike that of Vallabha, retained its chaste form. He severely punished any delinquents and Haridās, a beloved disciple of his, was turned out from his order for behaving indiscreetly in matters of sex. In the beginning Chaitanya had permitted women to join the *Saṅkīrtans*; later this practice was discouraged.

■ Macauliffe, I, 177.

■ Sarkar, *op. cit.*, 278; Tarachand, 219.

Conclusion

The saint-reformers continue to appear in a chain in the succeeding centuries, but the scope of the present work necessitates a review of the work of the reformers of the fifteenth century only. From Rāmānand to Chaitanya it is a long line of some of the greatest thinkers that the country has seen in any one century, and it can be asserted without any fear of contradiction that the fifteenth century in India was an Age of Socio-Religious Reformers.

These reformers gave to the people a simple religion. They believed in one God—Saguna or Nirguna. The Soul was His part and constantly strove to be one with Him or merge with Him. Communion with Him could not be achieved through rituals, pilgrimages, or adherence to the letter of the scriptures. The path of salvation lay in Bhakti. Salvation could be achieved by all; there was no distinction of caste or creed or religion before God. A devotee needed to have a Guru; there was no place for the exploiting priestly class. The Bhakta was not to attach himself to the mundane things of life, nor was he to retire completely from the world. These saints advocated a middle path of life. Theirs was a simple creed which every one could follow.

The contribution of these reformers in the religious field was great indeed, but it was still greater in the social sphere. By their message these saints revolutionised the Indian society in a peaceful, invisible way. They were men of very high order. Almost all of them travelled widely and extensively, and met people of all shades of opinion and all climes. They belonged to India and not to any state or province. They held cosmopolitan views; they reflected the common urge, the cherished views of their age.

The urge for unity which began during Timūr's invasion, when Hindus and Muslims stood shoulder to shoulder to fight the foreign invader, found its culmination in their teachings. The difference was that unity in the first case was born of adversity and necessity. In the case of these saints, their appeal was directed towards the hearts rather than towards the minds of the people. The doctrine of Bhakti went straight to the heart, and proved to be a panacea for the many prevailing ills. It showed the futility of meaningless religious conflicts when the essence of all religions was but the same.

It gave the privilege of communion with God to all—high and low—without distinction and without the aid of the self-seeking priestly class. It checked excessive polytheism with its rituals, ceremonies and superstitions and their debasing effects. The masters taught the lowly not to surrender to insolent might just as they taught the strong that all human beings were the children of one God. Their convincing attacks on the caste system helped raise the status of millions of down-trodden people. Perhaps their greatest contribution was the uplifting of the common low-caste man. Besides, their teachings created an atmosphere which produced ■■■ like Bodhan Brahman, Dongar Mal, Mān Singh and Ahmad Khan.

Just as these socio-religious reformers uplifted the social status of the common man, they also helped in the development of the language of the common people throughout the country. Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit were being cultivated in the secluded corridors of Islamic and Hindu institutions. The language of the common man possessed little literature and was hardly studied. Amīr Khusru was perhaps the first national poet who employed Persian metres in Hindi in which he composed many couplets, but by the fifteenth century Hindi got a definite shape at the hands of Sant Kavis like Kabīr, Raidās, etc. The message of these masters was delivered in simple but beautiful language. Their medium was poetry, mystical and philosophical, sarcastic yet soothing. They preached and composed in Hindi. Therefore, the importance of Sant Kāvya in Hindi language and literature is self-evident. Besides Sūfī poets like Qutban, Manjhan and Jaisi (and the great Bhakta poet Tulsī Dās in the sixteenth century) also greatly enriched Hindi literature. Similarly the Vaishnava poets of Bengal, Maharashtra and Gujarat contributed much to the development of the languages of their regions. In the Punjab, Gurū Nānak gave to the people a new dialect—Gurmukhī.

Thus the services of these saints to Indian religious thought, society, language and literature were great indeed. However, looking retrospectively, we find that they could not unite the Hindus and Muslims into one nation, though they spared ■■■ pains in their efforts to do so. People of the two faiths listened to their behests, followed their teachings, but then continued to cling to their religions tenaciously. On the death of Kabīr there ■■■ a

quarrel between his Hindu and Muslim followers about the disposal of his body. The story repeated itself on Nānak's death. In days to come if there was an Akbar in India, there was an Abdul Qādir Badaonī also; if there was a Dārā Shikoh, there was an Aurangzeb too. The division of India and creation of Pakistan (whatever the part played by the divide-and-rule policy of the British Government) points to the painful fact that centuries of association of the people of the two religions could not weld Indians into one nation. Why?

The work of these reformers lacked in many ways. Their audience generally comprised of low class people whose lot they had sought to improve. The high caste privileged classes seem to have hardly paid much attention to them. They even suspected their motives, and some Brahmans and Mullās even appealed to Sikandar Lodī to put a stop to the activities of Kabīr, which the king did. Now, when an idea or an appeal which is meant for all reaches or influences only a certain section or sections of people, it does not succeed in its purpose. This is what happened with the appeal of these masters. All sections of people appreciate their ideas today, but in their own times their appeal lay mainly with the lower strata of society. Even there they did not work with the intention of converting people to their "faith." Each master had his message to deliver; he did not approach the people in the must-convert spirit.

Again, although no society progresses only with the improvement of men, still there was no effort made to uplift the status of women. Nay, in the sixteenth century Tulsidās advocates a very uncharitable attitude towards them. Although emphasis on family life was a step forward, and although the Maharashtra saints did help raise the status of women in the south, in the north their plight hardly seems to have attracted the attention of the reformers.

Besides, their message lacked in emphasis on improving the economic condition of the people whom they had helped to see the light; and soon penury, fatal to progress, enveloped them in darkness again. Any social reform in India can be achieved the more successfully if it is given an economic basis. All efforts at reform are welcome, but there is no better leveller than prosperity; and changes in the economic life of a people bring in their wake many more social and psychological changes than mere religious reforms.

But unfortunately these masters could not shake off the element of fatalism so deep-rooted in Indian society. They shared the pessimistic view that the basic philosophy of Hinduism is incompatible with economic prosperity. Although they denounced renunciation, their message of Bhakti did lead to some sort of asceticism and aloofness from society, and the members of the various sects became separate entities having nothing much to do with the society as a whole. That is why though the attempts of the fifteenth century reformers were impressive and gallant in themselves, their achievements now do not seem to be great in retrospect.

And once these masters were on the scene no more, their message was forgotten by a people in whose mind caste and religious differences were built-in fixtures. As time passed the message of each thinker became a monopoly of his followers. Failing to understand the ideas of others, members of each group made unique claims and preached the inherent virtues of their own sect. Religious tolerance only came to mean that since people must live separately, let them live in peace. The result was that in place of all people coming together and uniting, there were some more sects added to the existing ones, and if differences were not actually accentuated they were not minimised.

But it would be unfair to judge the effect of the work of these socio-religious reformers for all the centuries that followed. In their own day they achieved good success. It was in the fifteenth century that a cry for Hindu-Muslim unity — first raised with any forceful voice and in so many parts of the country—by Nānak in the west, by Kabir in Madhya Desh and by Chaitanya in the east. It was well received too. People hailed it, Bābur appreciated it.¹¹

¹¹ While Gurū Nānak was residing at Aminābād (now venerated under the name of Rori-Sahab in the district of Gujranwala), Bābur's invasion of India took place. Aminābād was stormed and Nānak — carried to the Emperor's presence. Bābur was struck by his appearance, and still more by his words, and held a long conversation with him. It is narrated that while the Gurū was talking with the Emperor the servants brought *blāng*. Bābur offered some to the Gurū, who declined, stating that he had a supply which never failed him, and of which the effects were never exhausted. "Upon being asked to explain, he replied that he alluded to the name of God, the consideration of which occupied his faculties." The Emperor ordered his release.

and Akbar worked upon it. Therefore, the work of these reformers was unique and deserves all praise. They had created a stir in the minds of men and had revolutionised social values. The Mughals certainly ruled over a country and a society which bore the impress of the teachings of these master minds.



APPENDIXES



Appendix A

TĪMŪR'S MASSACRE OF THE INDIAN PRISONERS

THE FIGURE OF the prisoners massacred by Tīmūr on the eve of the battle of Delhi has been magnified by foreign chroniclers. Sharafuddin Yazdī says that on a very conservative estimate a hundred thousand Hindus were put to the sword. In the *Mulfūzāt*, Tīmūr also has — lac. ■ Khwānd says the same thing.¹ But this figure is challenged by Indian historians and contradicted by other statements of Yazdī himself. Sharafuddin, before giving the details of the massacre, says that by the time Tīmūr reached Delhi, "more or less" = hundred thousand prisoners had been captured.² According to the same authority, these included women and children also. According to all writers, including Yazdī himself, only men above the age of fifteen were killed; women and children were spared.³ Thus the massacred could not certainly have been a hundred thousand. Mir Khwānd copies Yazdī verbatim, but he could — through the mistake and while following Yazdī in all other details, takes care to say that "more than a lac Hindus had been captured".⁴ But Indian writers, whose sources in all probability included the writings of the above authors also, have a different story to tell. Nizāmuddin Ahmad and Yahyā say that between the Indus and the Ganga about 50,000 "people of India" had been taken captive.⁵ They certainly comprised both Hindus and Muslims; Indian writers nowhere say that only the Hindus were captured or massacred. Since the number of the cap-

¹ Z. N., II, 92 says, *بر روایت اکل صد هزار ہندوی عہ دین را بیخ جہاد بکشتند*. (According to a few (or on a conservative estimate), one hundred thousand faithless Hindus were dealt with (killed) by the sword of Jihād [Holy War].) Also M.T., E ■ D, III, 436; R.S., VI, 109, line 7.

² Z. N., II, 92 has *بہین منزل کم و بیش صد هزار ہندوی گتہ اند* (By this stage more or less one hundred thousand Hindus had been captured.)

³ *Ibid.*, II, 92-3.

⁴ R.S., VI, 109 line 7 has *زیاتہ از صد ہزار* (More than a hundred thousand.)

⁵ T. A., I, 255; T. M. S., 165.

tives was fifty thousand, the number of the massacred must have been less than that. Yahyā, Badaonī and Hajī Dabīr, however, put the number of the massacred at 50,000.⁴

Thus the unfortunate prisoners who lost their lives on that sanguine day were about fifty thousand and not one hundred thousand. They were both Hindus and Muslims and not only Hindus. Yazdī and his followers have inflated the figure in all probability to bestow honour on the conqueror, little realising that by exaggerating the ghastliness of the deed they were only discrediting their hero in the eyes of posterity.

Ahmad bin Arabshāh, who ■ places is quite critical of Tīmūr ever that his massacres "were prompted only by the exigencies of conquest and the necessities of world-empire".⁵ He used to massacre Muslims as mercilessly as he massacred the Indian prisoners of war. He caused two thousand prisoners to be built up in a wall in Sīstān (1383-84), he massacred 70,000 inhabitants of Isphahan in 1387, and he erected twenty towers of skulls at Aleppo and Damascus in the same year. The massacre of Indian prisoners was not ■ unique act of one who ■ responsible for incalculable bloodshed and suffering in the East.⁶

⁴ T. M. S., 165; Badaonī, Ranking, I, 356; Z. W., III, 905. Farishta's figure is one lac, I, 158.

⁵ Browne, *Literary History of Persia*, III, 181.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 180, 181, 197.

Appendix B

JASRAT KHOKHAR'S STRONGHOLD

THERE ■ A most perplexing plethora of variants of the place-name of Jasrat Khokhar's stronghold in the Kashmir hills. Yahyā calls it Tikhar (تیکھار) in ■ place,¹ and in another Tilhar.² Elliot's MSS. also had Tikhar.³ Badaoni has Talhar, and Ranking in a note adds that it is "in the Kashmir hill tracts".⁴ Nizāmuddīn⁵ has Thikah while Ferishta calls it Bisal.⁶

Hodivala writes a long note to show that the place was Palhārā or Parhālā lying about 12 miles east of Rawalpindi. But Parhālā and Dandgalī, situated about 40 miles ■ of Rawalpindi, which find mention by Bābur, Terry and De Laet, were strongholds of Gakkhars and not Khokhars. Hodivala realised it and was even prepared to concede that Jasrat ■ Gakkhar and not Khokhar.⁷

But according to all chronicles Jasrat was Khokhar and not Gakkhar. Besides, the time-table of the campaign is far too short for Mubārak Shāh to go to Rawalpindi. On 9 October (11 Shawwāl) he is ■ the banks of the Sutlej. He sends his officers up the river and himself follows. They attack Jasrat who flees. The Sultan collects all his baggage and issues in his pursuit. Crossing the Beas and the Ravi he marches through Jammu territory whose Raja comes to pay respects.⁸ After crossing the Chenāb and ravaging Jasrat's stronghold near Jammu, he marches back and arrives at Lahore early in January, 1422 (Muharram, 825=26 December, 1421 to 24 January, 1422).⁹ The time taken by Mubārak will not be sufficient for ■ distant campaign to Parhālā near Rawalpindi. Moreover, no chronicler mentions his crossing the Jhālum.

Similarly Bisal ■ Basaulī mentioned by Ferishta is on the Ravi and not across the Chenāb, and is, therefore, incorrect.

The place is, as Ranking locates in consultation with Stein, "the village Talwāra on the right bank of the Chenāb, just opposite to

¹ T.M.S., 197.

² *Ibid.*, 199 and n.

³ E and D, IV, 56-57.

⁴ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 383.

⁵ T.A., I, 272.

⁶ Ferishta, I, 164.

⁷ Hodivala, 404.

⁸ T. A., I, 272.

⁹ T.M.S., 197.

the town of Riāsi ($74^{\circ} 51' \text{ N. } 33^{\circ} 6' \text{ E.}$)".¹⁰ It lies in the hills about 50 miles north of Sialkot and would make ■ excellent hide-out for the chief of Sialkot. The mention of Jammu and its Raja here and in later campaigns against Jasrat is very significant. Tilwāra lies only 25 miles north-west of Jammu. Obviously the Raja of Jammu was familiar with the place and the countryside around it, and afraid of Jasrat's strength, he helped Mubārak Shāh in its sack.

¹⁰ Badaoni, *Ranking I*, 384.

Appendix C

ORIGIN OF THE LODIS

LODI IN THE Afghan tongue signifies the great, the grown up, the elder.¹ According to Muslim chronicles², in the eighteenth generation from Adam was born Ibrāhīm, the beloved friend of God. His ■■■ Yaqūb had twelve ■■■ who together were the progenitors of the tribes known as the Israelites. One of the descendants of Yaqūb, in the seventh generation after him, was Talut or Saul. Talut had two sons, one of whom was named Irmiya or Jeremiah. Irmiya had a son named Afghan, who is supposed to have given the name to the Afghan people.³ Qais, ■ descendant of Afghan, in the thirty-fifth generation from him, with many of his kinsmen or Bani Israel had settled in Ghor. They repaired to the Prophet's standard on an invitation from Khalik bin Walid one of Prophet Muhammad's companions, and were converted to Islam. Qais was given the name of 'Abdur Rashīd and with the help of his kinsmen, the Bani Israel, waged many wars on the Prophet's behalf. The Prophet was so pleased with Qais that he called him Malik (king) and Pehtan (keel or rudder of a ship) for showing his people the path of true religion. This explains how the Afghans and Pathans (changed from Pehtan) came into being and how they all love the title of Malik.

The story proceeds. Qais *alias* 'Abdur Rashīd *alias* Pehtan married ■ daughter of Khalid who bore him three sons named Sarban, Bātan and Ghurghust. One of the daughters of Bātan was Bibi Matto, who fell in love with Shāh Hussain, a prince of Ghor, and their intimacy reached ■ stage where her pregnancy could not be concealed. A marriage was the only course open, but the off-

¹ Olaf Caroe, *The Pathans*, 17, 440 n. 24.

² Ni'amatullah's *Makhsas-i-Afghāni* and *Tārīkh-i-Gurids*.

³ One of the several legends current among the Afghans about the origin of the word Afghan is that the mother of Afghan experienced great pangs before his birth. After delivery she exclaimed with relief, "Afghan" i.e. "I ■ free". Another version is that while in ■■■ ■■■ was crying "Fighān, Fighān" which in Persian means "Alas, Woe". Bellew, *Journal of a Political Mission to Afghanistan in 1857*, 56-57.

spring, a boy, was given the name of Ghilzāi—meaning in the Afghan language a son "born of theft".⁴ Bibi Matto's next son was Ibrāhīm. Observing marks of intelligence and wisdom ■ his great-grandson Ibrāhīm, Qais addressed him ■ Loi-dey (Lōdī)—that is Ibrāhīm is great. Siani, one of the ■■ of Ibrāhīm, had two sons Pranki and Ism'āl. Bahlūl, the founder of the Afghan empire in Delhi, was eight generations removed from Pranki and was a member of the Sahūkhel tribe of the Lodis. The Sūrs and Nūhānīs descended from Ism'āl's two sons Sūr and Nūh.⁵ Thus the Ghilzāis (Ghaljis), Lodis, Sūrs, Nūhānīs and Niazīs were common descendants of Bibi Matto and had close family ties.⁶

The erudite Abul Fazl believing in this tradition writes: "The Afghans consider themselves the descendants of the Israelites and declare their progenitor to be Afghan",⁷ but "some claim the Afghans to be Copts (i. ■ native Egyptian Christians) and state that when the Israelites came to Egypt from Jerusalem, this people wandered into Hindustan."⁸ Ferishta also lends support to this versions.⁹

Thus the ancestry of the Lodis and all other Afghan tribes is traced to the legendary Qais of the Bani Israel, to Egyptians, to Persians, etc. and "there is no matter more earnestly debated wherever Pathans assemble than that of the origins of this people".¹⁰

Now, the geneological account of the traditions is more or less mythical. It is "a curious accretion to Biblical history", although from the time of Talut (Saul) ■■ elements have been introduced in all probability to add ■ aureole to the Afghan people by tracing its pedigree to the great Jewish monarch. Writing in the time of Jahāngīr, when the Afghans in India had lost all hopes of recovering their power, it ■■ natural for Ni'āmatulla, ■ for that matter any Afghan chronicler, to look back with pride to the glories won by his race in the remote past. Besides, it was a widespread practice among the Muslims of putting forward an imposing geneology.

⁴ Caroe, 16 and 440 n. 23.

⁵ Raverty, J.A.S.B., 1875. 33-37.

⁶ *Ency. of Islam*, 151-52; Dorn, II, 49-50.

⁷ افغان خود را از بنی اسرائیل نژاد و افغان نام بزرگ میارند (Afghan considered himself

■ Bani Israel, and the Afghans earned great renown.) *Āin. Lith. Ed.*, 189-91.

⁸ Jarret, II, 402-3.

⁹ Ferishta, I, 17.

¹⁰ Caroe, 3.

tracing descent from Adam and claiming connection with the Prophet.

But the belief in their Jewish origin is widespread among the Afghans even to this day.¹¹ Raverty firmly believed in the story of Qais,¹² and Bellew defends it by saying that the Afghan claim of an Israelitish origin is based not only on an ancient tradition but also on close physiognomic resemblance with the Jews. Besides laws, customs and moral characteristics of the two are peculiarly akin.¹³ Longworth Dames controverts most of these arguments of physiognomic resemblance and customs.¹⁴ Sir Wolseley Haig also thinks that people have been deceived because of physiognomic resemblance.¹⁵ Another important fact may be noted here. As compared with Egypt or Israel, the Sulaiman ranges in Afghanistan — neither a very hospitable country nor — they situated very close to Egypt or Israel, and although the possibility of some refugees migrating to Afghanistan cannot be ruled out, yet large scale migrations as a precursor of a race are not a probability.

As we proceed from the mythical to the historical accounts we find that "Afghanistan and the North-West Frontier of Pakistan have — perhaps — invasions (and migrations) than any other country in Asia, or indeed the world".¹⁶ Between 550 B.C. and the fourth century A. D., Achaemenian (Iranian), Macedonian (in the wake of Alexander), Mauryan (Indian), Saka, Indo-Parthian, Kushān and Sassanian (all Iranian) dynasties invaded and ruled over eastern Afghanistan.¹⁷ And all the invaders, with the single exception of Alexander, had enrolled Iranians either from the central country itself or from nomadic peoples dwelling on the fringe of the Iranian world. Influence of Iranian language on

¹¹ Caroe, 9-4.

¹² Raverty, "Who — the Pathan Sultans of Delhi?" J.A.S.B., 1875. 33-75.

¹³ H. W. Bellew, *Journal of a political Mission to Afghanistan in 1857*, 46.

Bellew also notes that these very characteristics are common to both the Rajputs and the Afghans and even thought — Sarban, a progenitor of the Afghan race, was a corruption of Sūryabans (Solar race) from which many Rajputs claim descent. Bellew, *Races of Afghanistan*, 23-24. Also Cf. Caroe, 85-88.

¹⁴ *Ency. of Islam*, I, 149-53.

¹⁵ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, XIV Ed., I, 287.

¹⁶ Caroe, 25. ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 459-60.

Pakhtu is palpable and Olaf Caroe gives many words common in Pakhtu and Persian.¹⁸ Similarly N. B. Roy mentions many place names in Afghanistan which can be traced to as far back as the *Zenda Vesta* itself.¹⁹ In view of this Ibn Battūta's statement that "Kabul is inhabited by a people from Persia called Afghans",²⁰ gathers special significance. The Moorish traveller was a great observer and a great inquirer and he must have written after ascertaining what he saw. Even after the fourth century many more invasions of Afghanistan followed. The White Huns *alias* Ephthalite or Haytal (Turkish), Sassanian (Iranian), Kabul Shāhi and Zunbil (Turco-Iranian), Safavid (Iranian Muslim) and Hindu Shāhiya (Indian) ruled it by turns from the fifth to the eleventh centuries.²¹

In view of the facts given above it may be submitted that the Afghans have not descended from a single race. "A postulate that a group of peoples, so diversified as the Afghans and Pathans ... represent a pure and unsullied stream issuing from a single Hebrew source ... must carry its own refutation."²² They sprang from the mixture of many races including Jewish as their tradition avers, but more particularly from the Iranian, Ephthalite or Turkish, and Indian stocks. Just as in the case of Indian Christians and Muslims the origin of their name may be Jewish or Arabic, but the people are of the Indian nationality, even so in the case of Afghan and Lodi the name may be of Jewish origin but the people themselves sprang from the Iranian, Turkish and Hindu stocks the impress of whose language and culture is clearly visible in them.²³ Of all Afghan tribes the Ghaljis and Lodis were probably the most numerous, and possibly the most valiant.²⁴

A word may here be said about the Pathans who live particularly in eastern Afghanistan and the country of Roh. Roh is an Indian (southern Punjab) word for mountain, used by the Punjabis and

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 66.

¹⁹ N. B. Roy, *Ni'amatullah's History of the Afghans*, 19-20.

Olaf Caroe also says "The origins of Pakhtu-pashtu go further back into an older Iranian past." 69.

²⁰ Lee, *Travels of Ibn Battūta*, 98.

²¹ Caroe, 460.

²² Caroe, 25.

²³ This view is also shared by Longworth Dames in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, 149-53.

²⁴ Caroe, 18-19.

Jāts of Multan "seeing the Western-Mountain-Wall of the Sulaimans from their plains",²⁵ The Sulaiman ranges extend northwards from the Bugti country in Sindh up to Ghazni in the west and Peshawar in the east. According to the geneology discussed above, the word Pehtan (used by the Prophet for Qais) changed into Pathan in course of time. But the Durrānis believe that while they are pure Afghans, the Ghaljis, Yūsufzais, Kākars, Afridis, etc. are Pathans, that the Pathans ■ Afghans only by adoption and that they have not descended from Qais.²⁶ It is significant that neither Ibn Battūta nor Bābur mention the word Pathan. Bābur gives names of many Pathan tribes, but nowhere does he mention Pathans, Pakhtuns ■ Pashtuns. ■ calls the people only Afghan and their language Afghānī.²⁷ But his negative evidence does not prove that the Pathans ■ not Afghans. Both Bellew and Longworth Dames consider the two terms as appellations of a common people.²⁸ There is thus no racial difference as such between the two, but the word Afghan is applied to the people of Afghanistan proper while Pathan is commonly applied to the dwellers of Roh.

Another question which needs clarification is as to when the Afghans converted to Islam. The probable earliest reference to the existence of Afghans (Abgan) is in the third century Sassanian inscription. The Afghans are first referred to within India by the Indian astronomer Varaha Mihir. He calls them Vokkana in his *Brāhat-Samhita* written in the sixth century. Hiuen-Tsang also mentions a people whom he calls A-po-Kien in the northern part of the Sulaiman mountains who can be no other than Afghans.²⁹ Then occurred the Muslim invasions of Afghanistan, first under the Arabs in the seventh century, and later by the Saffarid dynasty in the ninth. Some conversions must have taken place, and Ibn Haukal writes that the Buddhists, Jews and Muslims each lived in a separate area of the city of Kabul.³⁰ Furthermore Alberuni, always a keen student, designated the Afghans of "the mountains to the west of India . . . extending up to the valley of Sindh" as Hindus.³¹

²⁵ Elphinstone, *Afghanistan*, 152. Caroe, 4 and 439 n. 4.

²⁶ Bellew, 62. ²⁷ Caroe, 155.

²⁸ Bellew, 65; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, 149.

²⁹ Caroe, 112. ³⁰ Sykes, *History of Afghanistan*, 159.

³¹ Alberuni, Sachau, 208, 317.

He calls Peshawar by its Hindu name Parushawar, and gives a large number of references to Gandhara—the Peshawar Valley—and talks of Indian Kings in Afghanistan, but their capital in his time was Vaihind.³² Thus the accounts of Ibn Haukal (ninth century), 'Utbī and Alberunī (eleventh century) leave no doubt that the Eastern Afghanistan had not been Islamised till the end of the tenth century. Mahmūd Ghaznī had to fight against the infidel Afghans in the Sulaiman mountains.³³ In the battle between Muhammad Ghori and Prithvirāj "the Afghans are represented as fighting on both sides which probably indicates that they were not yet completely converted to Islam".³⁴ In view of these facts the story of the conversion of Qais and his companions as early as the days of the Prophet stands discredited.³⁵

It will thus be seen that in the eleventh century when Alberunī wrote the Afghan tribes were established in eastern Afghanistan where they are to this day. They were not yet converted, and they were impatient of control.³⁶ Tall and fair, strongly built and warlike, they lived in penury, tending their sheep and at times supplementing their income by plunder. Their warlike character attracted the notice of conquerors to India who freely enrolled them in their armies. From the eleventh century onwards, the Afghans started coming into India — soldiers of fortune in the armies of various conquerors beginning from Mahmūd of Ghaznī. Mahmūd led many Afghan contingents into India and Muhammad Ghori in his last expedition brought ten thousand Afghan horsemen with him.³⁷ One of his commanders-in-chief was Malik Mahmūd Lodī, and "the ascendancy of the Lodis dates from this time".³⁸ In the time of Iltutmish, Jalāluddīn of Khawarizm, fleeing before Chingiz Khan, brought many Afghan soldiers with him. Some of them returned to their homeland, but many others under their leader Malik Khan took service under Iltutmish.³⁹ Balban employed three thousand Afghan horse and foot in the campaign against the Mewātīs,⁴⁰ and appointed a large number of Afghan officers and men for garrisoning outposts. The Afghans must have by this time got accus-

³² *Ibid.*, 317. ³³ Raverty, *Tabqat-i-Nāsiri*, English trans., 74 and n.

³⁴ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, 151.

³⁵ Caroe, 9.

³⁶ Caroe, 113.

³⁷ *Makhzan*, N. B. Roy's trans., 11.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 12, 13.

³⁹ Caroe, 135.

⁴⁰ *Tab. Nas.*, 315.

tomed to the adventure of soldiering in India, and there is reason to believe that they joined in large numbers in the various Mongol invasions during the time of the Khaljī monarchs—Jalāluddīn and 'Alāuddīn. Muhammad Tughlaq perhaps for the first time appointed ■ Afghan as the governor of Daulatabad,⁴¹ and Firōz Tughlaq appointed Malik Bīr Afghan ■ the governor of Bihar.⁴²

On his way to India, Timūr attacked the Afghan tribes of Lodīs and Sheranīs and ■ able to call upon them ■ furnish him with contingents.⁴³ In response to this, says Ni'amatulla, Malik Khizr Lodī, Malik Bahāuddīn Jalwānī, Malik Yūsuf Sarwānī and Malik Habib Niyāzī with twelve thousand men from Roh joined him in the invasion of India.⁴⁴ According to the same authority Malik Khizr and Malik Bahāuddīn died in a battle in the Siwaliks.

Saiyyad Khizr Khan, because of his unpopularity as Timūr's nominee in India, always needed outside help for maintaining his position and power, and during his administration many Afghans rose to the rank of nobles of high position. One such was Sultan Shāh Lodī. During the time of Khizr Khan and his successors a large number of iqt'ās were held by the Afghans. Malik Allahādīd Lodī was the governor of Sambhal,⁴⁵ Qutb Khan Afghan of Rapri and the Auhadīs of Bayana. In fact during this period and after, the history of the Afghans lay in India and not in their homeland,⁴⁶ and they constantly used to "exchange visits between Roh and Hindustan".⁴⁷ The Sultanate of Delhi was thus already dominated

⁴¹ T.F.S. (B), 5:4.

⁴² T.M.S., 133.

⁴³ Caroe, 137.

⁴⁴ Ni'amatulla's *History of the Afghans*, 14.

N. ■ Roy doubts the veracity of this statement (n. 1, 14) because according to the *Mulūk-i-Timūrī*, Timūr is ■ to have punished the Afghans. There is nothing wrong with Ni'amatulla's statement. The invaders used to force the Afghans into submission first, as ■ by Mahmūd of Ghazni, and then ask them to provide contingents.

Bābur who also enrolled Afghan levies, gives ■ interesting picture of how the Afghans, always difficult to deal with, ■ their submission when forced into it. ■ made captive and suing for mercy appeared with grass in their teeth, exclaiming "I am your ox". (Caroe, 156). Raverty gives another explanation of the ox. He says that the "bulls" refer to the Afghans' hairy face and the long curly hair hanging down their back.

Tab. Nas., English Trs., 632 n.

⁴⁵ T.M.S., 239.

⁴⁶ Caroe, 136.

⁴⁷ Ni'amatulla's *Afghans*, 15.

by the Afghans when Bahlūl Lodi finally seized power, so much so that, according to Erskine, Bahlūl Lodi "was raised to the throne by a confederacy of six or seven great Afghan chiefs".⁴²

■ Erskine, *Babur and Humayun*, I, 405.

Appendix D

GARHA KATANGA

NIZAMUDDIN, BADAONI AND Ahmad Yādgār¹ call the place Garhā Katanga. Ferishta has Garhā only.² Col. Ranking in a note in Badaoni's translation says, "It would ■■■ we should read Garha Katanga which is the name of the country bounded on the north by Panna, and on the south by the Dakhan".³ B. De the translator of the *Tabqāt-i-Akbarī* adds that "the name is not distinctly written" in the various MSS.⁴ Elliot in the translation of the *Tārīkh-i-Salātīn-i-Afghānā* reads it ■■■ Garra Kantak, but makes no effort to locate its site.⁵ Sir Wolseley Haig identifies it with Katangi, a village lying 23 miles from Jabalpur ■■■ the Jabalpur-Sagar Road.⁶

There can be no doubt that the place mentioned is Garha-Katanga only as we again find it referred to by Malik Muhammad Jaisi in his epic *Padmāvat* (written in Sher Shāh's time). While leading Prince Ratan Sen towards Simhaldwīp to obtain Padmīnī, his parrot-guide indicates the route thus:⁷

पहुँची जहाँ कुंद औ गोला, तबि बायें अंधियार सटोला ।
बस्तिन देखने रहहि तिलंगा, उत्तर बायें गढ़ काटंगा ॥

[On reaching Golkunda (Kund and Gola),
(And proceeding northwards),
Leave the Dark Pavilion (jungle area of Sagar-Damoh) on
the left.

On the south-east live the Telinganis (of Berar)
And on (their) north-west is Garh-Kātanga.]⁸

This Garha-Katanga is comprised of two villages, existing even

¹ T.A., I, 348; Badaoni, Ranking, I, 433; T.S.A., 73.

² Ferishta, I, 190, line 11.

³ Badaoni, Ranking, I, 433, n. 1.

⁴ T.A., De, I, 403, n. 1.

⁵ E and D, V, 12.

⁶ C.H.I., III, 248.

⁷ *Padmāvat*, 62.

⁸ For a discussion on this not too clear a route see *Padmāvat*, Edited by Dr V.S. Agrawala, Jhansi, Vik. 2012, 133-34.

today, four and two miles respectively west of Jabalpur town. For long the place has been a stronghold of Gonds. Close to Garha is situated the famous Madan Mahal.⁹ The place where Jalāl Khan went was, therefore, Garha-Katanga in close proximity to Jabalpur and not Katangi, as suggested by W. Haig. Katangi lies 23 miles from Jabalpur and has no connection with Garha whatsoever.

It would be interesting to note how Jalāl Khan came to Jabalpur from Malwa. There is a highway joining the two places. The river Narbada flows close to Jabalpur and passes through the vicinity of Mandu. Narbada is the only holy river in India on which Parikrama is done, that is, pilgrims go on foot from one end of the river to the other on one of its banks and crossing it at either of the ends repeat the process the other way round. Thus all through the year the pilgrims trek their way to and fro on its banks. The route along the river bank was the safest and the most convenient from Malwa to Garha-Katanga in those days and in all probability the fugitive prince took this route. In the winter season the river is also navigable at certain places in large boats and all through the year in small ones.

⁹ Imp. Gaz., C.P., 209.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Original Authorities

- ABDUL HAQ, *Akhbār-i-Akhyār* (Mujtabai Press, Delhi, 1914)
 ——— *Tārīkh-i-Haqq*, Cat. No. 33, MS. No. 89, Khudabaksh Library, Bankipore
- 'ABDULLA, *Tārīkh-i-Daḥdā*, Allahabad University MS. ■■■ Bankipore MS.
- ABU TURAB WALLI, *Tārīkh-i-Gujarat*, Bib. Ind. (Calcutta, 1909)
 Abu Tālib Husaini, See *Tīmūr*
- ABUL FAIZ, *Āin-i-Akbarī*, translated by H. S. Jarret (Calcutta, 1891, 1893, and Blochmann, 1927)
 ——— *Akbar Nāmā*, English translation by H. Beveridge (Calcutta, 1821)
- AHMAD IBN 'ARABSHAH, *'Ajd'ibul-Maqdūr fī Akhbār-i-Tīmūr* (Calcutta, 1818).
 Manuscript in the Azad Library, Bhopal, Catalogue of Arabic MSS, History Section MS. No. 3.
 Also see Saunders
- AHMAD SHAH, *The Bijak of Kabir* (Hamirpur, 1917)
- AHMAD YADGAR, *Tārīkh-i-Salātīn-i-Afghānā* ■■■ known as *Tārīkh-i-Shāhā*
 Bib. Ind. (Calcutta, 1939)
- AMIR HASAN 'ALA SUZI, *Fawa'id-ul-Fuād*, (Persian Text, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, Urdu Trs. Allah Wāk ki Dūkān, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore).
- ALBERUNI, *Alberuni's India* by Edward C. Sachau (Trubners Oriental Series, Kegan Paul, London, 1910)
- 'ALI MUHAMMAD KHAN, *Mawāt-i-'Alamād* (Fatehul Karīm Press, Bombay, 1307 H)
- AMIR KHUSRU, *Matla'-i-Anvar* (Aligarh, 1916)
 ——— *Afsar-ul-Fawa'id* (Urdu Translation, Sihla-i-Tasawwuf No. 81, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore)
 ——— *'A'jān-i-Khusrawi* (Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, 1876)
 ——— *Ghurrat-ul-Kamāl (Dibācha-i-Diḍān)*, ■■■ Text
 ——— *Deval Rant Khair Khan* (Aligarh, 1917)
- BABUR, ZAKIRUDDIN MUHAMMAD, *Memoirs of Bābur (Bāburnāmā)*, translated from the original Turki by A. S. Beveridge, 2 vols. (Luzac & Co., London, 1922)
 ——— *Memoirs of Bābur*, translated from ■■■ by John Leyden and William Erskine (London, 1826)
- BADAONI, 'ABDUL QADIR, *Muntahab-ul-Tawārīkh*, by Abdul Qādir ibn-i-Mulūk Shāh known as Al-Badaoni, Bibliotheca ■■■ text, Calcutta, and translation by Col. George S. A. Ranking (Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1898)
- BARBOSA, *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, 2 vols. (Hakluyt Society, London 1918-21)

- BASU, K. K., *Tārīkh-i-Mubārak SĀDĀ*, English Translation (Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1932)
- BEVERIDGE, MRS., A. S., See Bābur
- DE, B., *Tabqāt-i-Akbarī* by Nizāmuddīn Ahmed, English translation (Calcutta, 1931)
- DEFREMERY AND SANGUINETTI, See Ibn Battūta
- DORN, BENHARD, *History of the Afghāns*, translation of *Makāsāt-i-Afghān* (Oriental Translation Fund, London, 1829)
- DUGHLAT MIRZA HAIDER, *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, ■■■ Ross, Sir E. Denison
- FERISHTA, MUHAMMAD QASIM HINDU SHAH, *Gulshan-i-Ibrāhīmī*, better known as *Tārīkh-i-Ferīshī* (Persian Text [1905] and Urdu translation [1933], Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow). Also see Briggs
- FIROZ SHAH TUHLAQ, *Shat-i-Firās Shāhī*, Allahabad University MS.
- GIBB, H. A. R., See Ibn Battūta
- GULBADAN BEGUM, *Humayūn Nāmā*, translated by Mrs. A. Beveridge, New Series No. 14 (Royal Asiatic Society, London, 1902)
- HAJI DADJA, *Zafar-ul-Wāh bi Musaffar 'Alī*, edited by Sir Denison Ross ■■■ *An Arabic History of Gujarat*, 3 volumes (1910, 1921)
- HAMDULLA MUSTAUFĪ, *Tārīkh-i-Gujarā*, Gibb Memorial Series, London, 1910
- IBN BATTUTA, *The Rehla of Ibn Battūta*, translation with commentary (Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1953)
- *Travels of Ibn Battūta*, translation with notes by Rev. Samuel Lee (London, 1829)
- *Voyages D 'Ibn Battūta*, Texte Arabe, Accompagne D'une Traduction Par C. Defremery et Dr. B. R. Sanguinetti, 4 tomes (Paris, 1914)
- *Ibn Battūta's Travels in India and Africa*, by H. A. R. Gibb (Broadway Travellers, London, 1929)
- IBN HAUKAL, *Asṣḥalul Balād*, Bib. Geographicum Arabicorum, also translation into English by William Ousley
- JAHANGIR, *Memoirs*, See Rogers and Beveridge
- JALSI, MALIK MUHAMMAD, *Padmāvat*, Nagri Pracharni Sabha Series, Kashi
- KABIR, MUHAMMAD, *Ajāib-i-Shāhān*, British Museum MS.
- KARNAPURA, KAVI, *Chaitanya Chandrodaya*, Bib. Ind., Calcutta
- KAUTILYA, See Shamashastry
- KHAFI KHAN, *Muntahab-ul-Lubb*, Bib. Ind., 1869
- KING, J. S., *Burhān-i-M'asir*, translation in Indian Antiquary, XXVIII (1899, Bombay)
- LEE, REV. SAMUEL, See Ibn Battūta
- LEYDEN AND ERSKINE, See Bābur
- MADHAVA, *Vibhāmudaya*, See Mādhava under Modern Works
- MAQDĪ HUSAIN, See Ibn Battūta
- MANU, See John Hopkins
- MIAN BHU, *Madanush Shifī Siḥandārī*, also known as *Tibb-i-Siḥandārī*, by Mīan Bhū son of Khawās Khan, manuscript belonging to Nawab

Faujdar Khan, Azad Library Bhopal, Catalogue of Persian MSS., Medicine Section, No. 33

MIR KHAWAND, *Rauzat-us-Safā* (Bombay, 1271 H). Also see Price, Major David

MINKAJ SIRAJ, *Tabqāt-i-Nāsirī* (Bib. Ind., Calcutta, 1864). Also see Raverty
 MUHAMMAD MUBARAK, SAYYAD (ALIAS MIR KHURD), *Siyārat-i-Auliya* collection of miscellany of N[] Auliya, *Silsila-i-Tasawwuf*, Urdu, No. 130, Allah Wali Ki Dükān, Lahore, no []

NI'AMATULLA, *Makhsan-i-Afghāni* (part of Ibrāhīm Batani's *Tawārīkh-i-Majlis-i-Arafi*) photoprint copy of Add. 21, 911 of the British Museum (belonging to Dr. Raghuvir Singh). Also see Dorn, Bernhard. Roy, N. B.
 NIHAWANDI, ABDUL BAGI, *Ma'āsh-i-Rahimi*, Bib. Ind. (Calcutta, 1924)
 NIZAMUDDIN AHMAD, KHAWAJA, *Tabqāt-i-Akbari* (Lucknow text, 1875, Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1927)

Also see Do, B

NIZAMUDDIN AULIYA, *Rahāsi Gulab*, Urdu translation (Allah Wali Ki Dükān, Lahore, [] date)

QALQASHINDI, ABU AL-'ABBAS, *Kitāb Subh al-A'sha*, 14 volumes (Cairo, 1914-19). Also see Spies

RIZQULLA, *Waqiāt-i-Mushāghā*, photoprint copy of Add. ix, 633 of the [] Museum MS., in possession of Dr. Raghuvir Singh, Sitaman

ROGERS AND BEVERIDGE, *Memoirs of Jahāngir*, English translation of *Tuzuk-i-Jahāngiri* (Oriental Translation Fund, London, 1909)

ROSS, SIR DENISON, *A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia*, being the translation of Mirza Haidar Dughlat's *Tārīkh-i-Rasā'id* by Ney Elias and Denison Ross (London, 1898)

ROWLANDSON, M. J., *Tuhfat-ul-Mujāhidin*, a historical work in Arabic, English translation (1813)

ROY, N. B., *Ni'amatulla's History of the Afghāns* by N.B. Roy (Santiniketan, 1958)

SAUNDERS, J. H., *Tamerlane or Timur the Great*, Life of Timūr by Ahmad bin Arabshāh entitled *Kitāb-i-Ajāib fī Akhbār-i-Timūr*, translated from the Arabic by Saunders (Luzac & Co., London, 1936)

SEAMS SIRAJ 'AVIF, *Tārīkh-i-Firās Shāhi*, Bib. Ind. Text Series (Calcutta, 1890)

SHARAFUDDIN YAZDI, *Zafar Nāma*, Bib. Ind., 2 volumes (Calcutta 1885-8)

SAIDI 'ALI REIS, *Travels* (1553-56), translated by A. Vambrey (Luzac & Co., London, 1899)

SIKANDAR BIN AHMAD, *Mawāt-i-Sikandar* (Fatehul Karim Press, Bombay, 1308 H)

SUJAN RAI BHANDARI, *Khatimat-i-Tawārīkh*, edited by K. B. Zafar Husain (Delhi, 1918)

TIMUR, AMIR, *Mulfūdat-i-Timūri*, translated in Elliot and Dowson's *History of India*.

- TROYER AND SHEA, *Debistān-i-Masūkh* of Mohsin Fānī
Tuzuh-i-Timūrī, [] by Abu Tālib Husainī (Fatehul Karim Press,
 Bombay, 1307 H)
 MS. belonging to Nawab Faujdar Muhammad Khan, Azad Library,
 Bhopal, Persian Catalogue, History Section, MS. No. 7
 VIDYAPATI, *Kivīlāt* (The Indian Press, Allahabad)
 WASSAF, 'ABDULLA, *Tajziyāt-ul-Asār va Tajriyāt-ul-Asār*, better known as
Tarīkh-i-Wassāf, C. 1327 Bombay text
 YAOYAVALKA, See Shri Krishna []
 YAHYA, *Tarīkh-i-Mubdarrak Shām*, of Yahyā bin Ahmad bin 'Abdulla As-Sar-
 hindī, edited by M. Hidayat Husain (Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1931)
 ZAINUDDIN, *Tuḥfatul Muḥḥidin*, Arabic text (Lisbon, 1898). English trans-
 lation by Rowlandson
 ZAFAR HUSAIN, See Sujan Rai
 ZIYAUDDIN BARANI, *Tarīkh-i-Firuz Shām* (Bib. Ind. Calcutta, 1862)

Modern Works

- ABDUL LATIF, *Agra, Historical and Descriptive* (Calcutta, 1896)
 AGNIDEN, N. P., *Muhammadian Theories of Finance* (New York, 1916)
 AHMAD KHAN, SIR SAYYAD, *Āsar-us-Sanādīd* (Kanpur, 1904)
 AJYANGAR, K. S., *South India and Her Muhammadian Invaders* (Madras,
 1921)
 AKHTAR 'ABBAS RIZWI, SAYYAD, *Uṭar Timūr Kāṁ Bihār*, 2 vols. (Aligarh,
 1958, 1959)
 ANANT DAS, *Kabir Siddhanta Dipika* (Ranchi)
 Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Director General of Archaeology
 ARNOLD, THOMAS W., *The Preaching of Islam* (third edition, London, 1935)
 ——— *The Caliphate* (Oxford, 1924)
 ASHRAF, K. M., *Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan*, from the
 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, I, 1935
 BALI, TARAKNATH, *Kabir [] Sār*, Vinod Pustak Mandir (Agra, 1956)
 BANERJI, RAJMAL DAS., *History of Orissa*, 2 vols. (Calcutta, 1930-31)
 BAYLEY, SIR E. C., *History of India as Told by its Own Historians, The Local
 Muhammadian Dynasties, Gujarat* (London, 1886)
 BASHAM, A. L., *The Wonder that [] India* (Sidgwick [] Jackson, London,
 1954)
 BEALE, T. W., *An Oriental Biographical Dictionary*, revised by H. G. Keene
 (London, 1910)
 BELLEW, H. W., *The Races of Afghanistan* (Calcutta, 1880)
 ——— *Journal of a Political Mission to Afghanistan* (1837) (Smith Elder &
 Co., London)
 BHANDARKAR, R. G., *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems*
 (Poona, 1938)
 BHATKHANDI, V. N., *A Short Historical Survey of Music in Upper India*

- BRETSCHNEIDER, E., *Medicinal Researches from Asiatic Sources*, 2 vols. (London, 1910)
- BRIGGS, JOHN, *History of the Rise of Muhammadan Power in India Till the Year 1612*, translation from the *Tarikh-i-Farishtah*, 2 vols. (Calcutta, 1910)
- BROWN, E. G., *Literary History of Persia*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1928)
- BURRESS, JAMES, *Muhammadan Architecture of Ahmadabad* (1901)
- CAROE, SIR OLAF, *The Pathans* (Macmillan & Co., London, 1958)
- CARR STEPHEN, *Archaeology ■■ Monumental Remains of Delhi* (Thacker Spink & Co., Calcutta, 1876)
- Central India States Gazetteer*
- COLB, *Report of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India*, 3 Reports (Government Press Calcutta, 1882-1883)
- COMMISSARIAT, M. S., *History of Gujarat*, vol. I (Bombay, 1938)
- CONSTABLE, *Hand Atlas of India*, 1893
- CROOK, W., *Tribes and Castes of the N.W.P. and Oudh*
- CUNNINGHAM, A., *Ancient Geography of India* (1871)
- DAVY, MAJOR, *Institutes of Timur* (Oxford, 1783)
- DIKSHITAR, V. R. RAMCHANDRA, *War in Ancient India* (Macmillan & Co., 1944)
- DIWAKAR, R. R., *Bihar Through the Ages* (Orient Longmans, 1959)
- EDWARDS, M. S., *Bābur : dictator and despot* (London, 1926)
- ELLIOT, SIR CHARLES, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, 3 vols. (London, 1921)
- ELLIOT, SIR HENRY, *History of India as told by its Own Historians*, Sir Henry Elliot and John Dowson, 8 volumes (London, 1867)
- ELLIOT, *Races of the N.W. Provinces*, Beam's Edition
- Epigraphia Indica*
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*, IXth Edition
- Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Luzac & Co., 1913-34)
- Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica*
- ELPHINSTONE, *Afghanistan* (London, 1814)
- ERSKINE, WILLIAM, *A History of India under Baber and Humayun*, 2 vols. (Longmans, London, 1854)
- FANSEAW, *Delhi Past and Present*, 1901
- FARQUHAR, JAMES, *An Outline of Religious History of India* (Oxford, 1920)
- FERGUSON, JAMES, *History of Indian ■■ Eastern Architecture*, 2 vols. (London, 1910)
- FURER ■■ SMITH, *The Sharqi Architecture of Jaunpur* (Arch. Sur. Ind., Calcutta, 1889)
- GHANI, M. A., *History of Persian Language and Literature* (The Indian Press, Allahabad, 1929)
- GHOSE, J. C., *Bengali Literature* (Oxford, 1948)
- GIBSON, EDWARD, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 2 vols. (Modern Library, Penguin, London, ■■ date)
- HABIBULLA, A. B. M., *The Foundation of the Muslim Rule in India* (Lahore, 1945)

- HARG, SIR WOLSELEY, *Cambridge History of India*, vols. III, & IV (1928, 1937)
 ——— *Comparative Tables of Muhammadan and Christian Dates* (Luzac & Co., London, 1932)
- HAROLD LAMB, *Tamerlane ■ Earth Shaker* (Thornton Betterworth, London, 1929)
- HASAN, MOHIBUL, *Kashmir Under the Sultans* (Iran Society, Calcutta, 1939)
- HAVELL, E. B., *History of Aryan Rule in India* (G. Harrap, London, 1918)
 ——— *A History of Ancient and Medieval Architecture of India* (London, 1918)
- Hearn, H. C., *Seven Cities of Delhi* (London, 1906)
- HODIVALA, S. H., *Studies in Indo-Muslim History* (Bombay, 1939)
 ——— *Supplement to the above*, 1937
- HOLDICK, ■ THOMAS, *Gates of India* (Macmillan ■ Co., 1910)
- HOPKINS, JOHN, *Manu Dharma Shastra*, translation of Manuscript (London, 1884)
- HUGHES, T. P., *Dictionary of Islam* (W. H. Allen & Co., London, 1885)
- ILIN, M., *Man and Mountains*, translated by K. Beatrice (George Routledge ■ Sons, London, 1936)
- ISHWARI PRASAD, *A History of the Qazvinian Turks in India*, vol. I (The Indian Press, Allahabad, 1936)
 ——— *History of Medieval India* (The Indian Press, Allahabad, 1940)
- Islamic Culture*, published by ■ Islamic Culture Board, Hyderabad, Deccan
- JADU BHATTACHARYA, *Hindu Castes and Sects*
Journal of Indian History
Journal (and Proceedings) of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
Journal of the Bombay Branch of the A.S.B.
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
Journal Asiatique, Paris
Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University
Journal of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay
- KABIR, HUMAYUN, *Cultural Heritage of India* (National Publications, Bombay, 1946)
- KEAY, F. E., *A History of Hindi Literature* (The Heritage of India Series, London, 1923)
- KEITH, A. BERRIEDALE, *A History of Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford, 1948)
 ——— *The Sanskrit Drama* (Oxford, 1924)
 ——— *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature* (The Heritage of India Series, 1923)
- Kennedy, Pringle, *The History of the Great Moghuls from 1398 to 1739*, 2 vols. (Thacker Spink & Co., Calcutta, 1905)
- KHAZAN SINGH, *A History and Philosophy of Sikhism*, 2 vols.
- LAL, K. S., *History of the Khaljys* (The Indian Press, Allahabad, 1930)
- LANEPOOLE, STANLEY, *The Muhammadan Dynasties* (Archibald Constable ■ Co., London, 1894)

- LANEPOOLE, STANLEY, *Medieval India under Muhammadan Rule* (T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., London, 1903)
- *Catalogue of Coins in the British Museum* (Volume 2, Muhammadan States, London, 1883)
- List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments*, 2 vols. (Government Press, Calcutta, 1912)
- LAW, N. N., *Promotion of Learning in India under Muslim Rule* (London, 1926)
- LONGHURST, A. H., *Hampi Ruins* (Madras, 1917)
- MACAULIFFE, MAX ARTHUR, *The Sikh Religion, Its Gurus, Sacred Writings and Authors*, 6 volumes (Oxford, 1909)
- MACCRINDLE, W. J., *Ancient India Fragments*, 1882
- MADHAVA, *Vibhāṇudaya—Kāyaṁ*, Text and English Translation by K. K. Lele and Pandit Anant Shastri Upadhyā, with a critical analysis by Dr. Hiranand Shastri (Rewa Darbar, 1938)
- MAHDI HUSAIN, AGHA, *Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq* (Luzac & Co., London, 1938)
- MAHTAB, HARS KRUSHNA, *The History of Orissa* (Lucknow, 1947)
- MAJID KHUDDARI, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam* (John Hopkins, Baltimore, 1955)
- MAJOR, R. H., *India in the Fifteenth Century* (Hakluyt Society, London, 1857)
- MOHAMMAD HABIB, *Indian Culture and Social Life at the Time of Turkish Invasions* (Aligarh Historical Research Institute, Aligarh, no date)
- MORELAND, W. H., *India at the Death of Akbar* (Macmillan & Co., 1920)
- *The Agrarian System of Moslem India* (Cambridge, 1929)
- MUKERJEE, RADHA KUMUD, *A History of Indian Shipping* (Orient Longmans, 1957)
- MUNSHI, K. M., *The Delhi Sultanate*, edited by K. M. Munshi (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1960)
- Nagari Pracharini Sabha Bulletin* (Hindi)
- NAZIM, MUHAMMAD, *The Life and Times of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna* (Cambridge University Press, 1931)
- OJHA, GAURI SHANKAR HIRA CHAND, *Rajasthan Ka Itihas*, 3 parts (Ajmer, 1916)
- *Madhya Kālin Bharatiya Sanskriti* (Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, 1928)
- PAOK, J. A., *A Guide to the Qutb Delhi* (1938)
- PANDEY, A. B., *The First Afghan Empire in India* (Bookland, Calcutta, 1956)
- PANIKKAR, K. M., *A Survey of Indian History* (The National Information and Publications, Bombay, 1947)
- *Malabar under the Portuguese* (D. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay, 1929)
- PARASURAM CHATURVEDI, *Soni Kavya* (Kitab Mahal, Allahabad, 1952)
- PELSAERT, F., *Jahangir's India* (The Remonstrantia), translated from the Dutch by W. H. Moreland and P. Geyl (Cambridge, 1925)

- PERCY BROWN, *Indian Architecture (Islamic Period)*, (third Edition, D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay, no date)
- PRICE, MAJOR DAVID, *Memoirs of the Principal Events of Muhammadan History* (London, 1921)
- Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*
- Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*
- QURESHI, I. H., *Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi*, Lahore (1942)
- RANKING, S. A., See Badami.
- RAVERTY, MAJOR H. G., *The Mirkān of Sindh and its Tributaries* (J.A.S.B., 1892)
- *Notes on Afghanistan* (London, 1886)
- *Tabqat-i-Nāsiri*, English translation, 2 vols. (London, 1881)
- RENNEL, JAMES, *Memoir of a Map of Hindustan* (London, 1793)
- RICE, LEWIS, *Mysores and Coorg from the Inscriptions* (London, 1909)
- RIEU, CHARLES, *Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the British Museum*, 3 vols. (London, 1879-83)
- RODGERS, *Revised List of Objects of Archaeological Interest in the Punjab*, (London, 1885-90)
- ROGERS and BRIDGEMAN, *Memoirs of Jahāngir*, English Translation of *Tuzk-i-Jahāngiri* (Oriental Translation Fund, London, 1909)
- ROUSSELET, L., *L'Inde des Rajas* (Paris, 1875)
- RUSHBROOK WILLIAMS, *An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century* (Longmans, 1918)
- SARASNA, R. B., *A History of Urdu Literature* (Publishers Ram Narain Lal, Allahabad, 1940)
- SALE, GEORGE, *The Koran* (London, 1844)
- Sant Vānt Sangrah* (Belvedere Press, Allahabad)
- SARDA, HAR VILAS, *Mahārāṇi Kumbhā* (Ajmer, 1917)
- *Mahārāṇi Sangū* (Ajmer, 1913)
- SARKAR, J. N., Translation of *Chaitanya Charitamrita* by Krishna Dās Kavirāj.
- *Chaitanya's Pilgrimages and Teachings* (Calcutta, 1913)
- *Military History of India*, serialised in *The Hindustan Standard*, 1954
- SEELY, *The Road Book of India*, 1825
- SEN, D. C., *History of Bengali Language and Literature* (Calcutta University, 1911)
- SEN, M. K., *Kabir*, 4 parts (Santiniketan, 1910-1911)
- SEWELL, ROBERT, *A Forgotten Empire (Vijayanagara)* (London, 1900)
- SRINIVASAIAH, *Arthashastra of Kautilya*, English Trans. Mysore, 1923
- SHYAM SUNDAR DAS, *Kabir Granthāvalī*, Nagri Pracharini Sabha Series No. 33, Sam. 2008
- SITARAM SARAN BHAGWAN PRASAD, *Nabhaṭi's Bhakti Māla* (Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow)
- SHIBLI NUMANI, *Shēr-ul-'Ajam* (Ma'arif Press, Azamgarh, 1325 H)

- SHRI KRISHNA DAS, *Yāgyavalka Smṛiti*, edited by S. K. Das (Kalyan, Bombay, Sam. 1980, Saka, 1845)
- SHURROCK, J., *District Manuals*, South Kanara
- SMITH, V. A., *Akbar the Great Mogul* (Oxford, 1919)
- SPIES, OTTO, *Sudā al-A'sha*. Chapter on India translated by Otto Spies as "An Arab Account of India in the 14th Century" (Muslim University Press, Aligarh, ■ date)
- STEWART, CHARLES, *The History of Bengal, from the First Muhammadan Invasion Until 1757* (London, 1813)
- TARA CHAND, *Influence of Islam ■ Indian Culture* (Indian Press, Allahabad, 1946)
- TITUS, *Indian Islam* (Madras, 1938)
- TOD, LT. COL. JAMES, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, edited by William Crooke, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1920)
- TRIPATHI, R. P., *Some Aspects of Muslim Administration* (The Indian Press, Allahabad, 1936)
- *Rise and Fall of the Mughal Empire* (Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1956)
- TRITTON, A. S., *Caliphs and their Non-Muslim Subjects* (London, 1930)
- VAIDYA, C. V., *History of Medieval Hindu India*, 3 vols. (Poona, 1921)
- VAMBREY, See Sidi 'Alī Reīs.
- VARTHEMA, *The Travels of Ludovic VartHEMA*, ■■■■■ by G. P. Badger (Hakluyt Society, London, 1863)
- WESTCOTT, G. H., *Kabir and Kabir Panth* (Cawnpore, 1907)
- WILLIAMS, MONIER, *Hinduism* (London, 1877)
- WILLIAMS, RUSHBROOK, See Rushbroock Williams
- WILSON, *Religious Sects of the Hindus*
- WRIGHT, NELSON, *Coinage and Metrology of the Sultans of Delhi* (Delhi, 1936)
- YUGALANAND, *Kabir Sahib Ki Sāhiti* (Lucknow)
- YULE, COL. HENRY, *See Marco Polo*, ■ vols. (London, 1903)
- YUSUF 'ALL A., *Medieval India : ■■■■■ and Economic Conditions* (London, 1932)
- YUSUF HUSAIN, *Glimpses of Medieval Indian Culture* (Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1957)



INDEX

- ASHAF CHANDRA, OF CHANDWIKR.** ■
 'Abdulla, historian, 132, 160, 184, 188, 207, 209, 243, 258, 273
 'Abdulla, Shaikh, Scholar, 244, 245, 247
 'Abdul Qadir, also Qadir Shāh, governor of Kalpi, 60, 106, 112
 'Abdur Razzāq, 71n, 240, 257, 275, 276
 Abu, 68
 Abū Bakr, Sultan of Delhi, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 70
 Abū Bakr, of Nagar, 183
 Abul Fazl, historian, 276
 Adalaj, 239
 Ādam Khan Kākar, 208, ■
 Ādam Khan Lodi, appointed governor of Dholpur, 175
 'Adil Khan, also known ■ Khandu, brother of ■ Iqbāl Khan, 10
 'Adil Khan (Berar), 182
 'Adil Khan (Meerut), 44
 Ādina mosque, 237
 Afghanistan, 14, 126
 'Afrī, Shams Sirāj, historian, 249, 258, 266, 269, 280
 Agra, early history, 176-7n., 192, 199, 203
 Ahar, 73, 115, 129
 Ahmad Khan, brother of Āzam Humayūn Lodi, 212
 Ahmadabad, 65; architecture of, 238-39
 Ahmad bin Arabshāh, historian, 320
 Ahmad Khan Bhatti, 155, 193n.
 Ahmad Khan Mewati, 123, 137
 Ahmad Khan, ■ of Yūsuf Khan Jalwāni, 145
 Ahmad Khan, of Lakhnor, 193, 211, 312
 Ahmad Mirza, Sultan, uncle of Bābur, 216
 Ahmadnagar, 62, 66
 Ahmad Shāh, of Gujarat, 65, 75, 76, 120; his buildings, 238, 250
 Ahmad Thanāsi, Maulānā, 31
 Ahmad Yādgār, historian, 134, 153, 154, 189, 225, 243, 275
 Ahroni, 22
 A'Isuddīn Khokhar, 92
 Ajit Singh Rathor, of Rampur, ■
 Ajmer, ■
 Ajodhan, 10, 19, 20, 21, 42, 53
 Akbar, Mughal Emperor, 37
 'Alai Darwāzā, 231
 'Ālam Khan Lodi, brother of Si-kandar Lodi, 162, 164, 174, 175, 205, 218, 219, 220, 221
 Alankua, supposed ancestress of Timūr, 14
 'Alāuddīn 'Ālam Shāh Saiyyad, accession, 123; leaves for Badaon, 125; estimate, 127-28, 130, 133; death, 146, 148, 150, 229, 262
 'Alāuddīn Khalji, 1, 24, 62, 64, 67, 188, 201, 231, 238, 258, 280, 329
 'Alāuddīn Muhammad Bukhari, 41
 Alberuni, historian, 257, 290, 291
 Alexander of Macedon, 15
 Alhanpur, 154, 157, 167
 'Ali ■ Nishāni, Maulānā, 248
 Aligarh, 107
 'Ali Khan Nagori, 184
 'Ali Khan, Saiyyad, governor of Behrah, 180
 'Ali Malik, of Uchch, 13, 26
 'Ali Shāh, of Kashmir, 83, 86
 Allahabad, 169
 Allahādād, Malik, general of the Timūr, 22, 24, 26, 27, 32, 33
 ■ Kālā Lodi, also known as ■ Kālū, 73, 87, 91, 94, 97, 115, 117, 129, 131
 Alp Khan, of Malwa, 62

- Alwar, 58n., 104
 Amīr 'Alī Gujarātī, 115
 Amīrān-i-Sadāh, 2, 2-3n.
 Amīr Gangū, 115
 Amīr Husain, Egyptian naval commander, ■
 Amīr Jahān Shāh general, of Tīmūr, 24, 26, 32, 36
 Amīr Khusrū, 242, 243, 253, 257, 274, 275, 312
 Amīr Muzaffar, nephew of Shaikh 'Alī, 92, 99
 Amīr Nūruddīn, officer of Tīmūr, 22, 26, 27, 35
 Amīr S'aid, officer of Tīmūr, ■
 Amīr Shāh Malik, officer of Tīmūr, 19, 23, 26, 27, 30, 35
 Amīr Sulaiman, officer of Tīmūr, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 32, ■
 Amīr Tīmūr, *see* Tīmūr
 Amīr Turghay, father of Tīmūr, 14
 Amīr Yādgār Barlās, officer of Tīmūr, 26
 Amritsar, 304
 Amroha, 90, 114, 116
 Anatolia, 35
 Andijan, 216
 Anhilwara, 6
 Aonia, 78
 Ārafsh Khan, 221
 Asāwal, 50
 Aswān, 19
 ■ mosque, 234, 235
 Athnastus Nikitin, 257, ■
 Ātmānanda, 194
 Atrauli, near Allgarh, 107
 Aurangzeb, Mughal Emperor, 37, 313
 Avadh, 3, 45, 100, 202
 Avadgarh, also known as Uditnagar and Utgr, 177, 178, 180
 Āzam Humayd, son of Khwājā Bayezīd, 152, 162, 164, 165, 193n., 201, 208
 Āzam Humayūn Sarwani, governor of Kara under Ibrāhīm Lodī, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 211, 212, 213
 Āzam Khan Kharasāni, 7
 Azerbaijan, 29
 'Asrulla Tulambī, Shaikh, Scholar, 244
 BABA KĪ BŪ, SIKH PILGRIMAGE CENTER, 301
 ■ Khan, 175
 Bābur, Zahiruddīn Muhammad, 1, 64, 66, 180, 215; early life, 216-17; frontier raids, 217-22; battle of Panipat, 222-26, 237, 276, 278, 282; his impressions of India, 284-86, 314, 327
 Bādagarh, outer citadel of Gwalior, 205
 Badson, 59, 73, 79, 107, 113, 117, 124, 125, 133, 146, 151, 245
 Badson Gate, at Delhi, 4
 Badaoni, Abdul Qādir, historian, 11, 72, 248, 313, 320
 Bādham, 74
 Badruddīn Muhammad, Arabic Scholar, 250
 Bagesar, 150
 Baghelkhand, 193
 Baghlan, 15
 Bahādur Nāhar, 2, 3; his Kotla, 5, 8, 11, 31, 46, 54, 58, 81, 104
 Bahādur Shāh I of Gujarat, 63, 222
 Bahār Khan, 98
 Bahāuddin Jalwāni, Malik, 329
 ■ Lodī, Sultan of Delhi, 63, 65, 69, 117, 118, 119, 121, 123, 126; Coronation, 127; early career, 130-31; War with the Sharqs, 134-135, 138, 145, 147; death, 156; estimate, 157, 160, 161, 162, 166, 167, 173, 185, 193n., 194n., 224, 244, 264, 328, 330
 Bahmani, Kingdom, 61, 62, 102
 Bahraich, 9, 45, 187
 Bahrām Khan, governor of Samana, 53, 54, 264
 Bahroz, *see* Rai Bahroz

- Bai Harir, 239
 Baijū, musician, 243
 Bailā (near Jammu), 98 &n.
 Bairam Khan, Turkbachchā, 55.
 56, 58, 76, 264
 Bajwara, 80, 97
 Bakri, modern Bhogpur, 36
 Balāram, pargana, 7
 Balban, Ghayāsuddin, 1, 201, 328
 Bandūgarh, 170, 172
 Bangarmau, 212
 Bannu, 16
 Baran, 28, 44, 57, 81, 115, 137
 Barani, ■■■ Ziyāuddin Barani
 Bārbak Shāh, son of Ibrāhīm ṢLodi,
 appointed governor of Jaunpur,
 151, 162, 164, 165, 169, 186
 Barbosa, 260, 278
 Bari, pargana of, 156
 Barīā, Tribe, 13
 Bayana, 10, 12, 45, 75, 77, 82, 100,
 108, 130, 167, 175, 176, 185. ■■■
 Bāz Bahadur, 237
 Beas, river, 88, 93
 Behrām Lodi, grandfather of Bahlūl
 Lodi, 131
 Behjat Khan, governor of Chanderi,
 181, 182, 183, 109
 Bengal, 61, 62, 69, 278; architecture
 of, 236
 Berar, 62
 Bhai Balā, companion of Gurū
 Nānak, 301
 Bhai Mardānā, companion of Gurū
 Nānak, 301
 Bharatpur, 58
 Bhatinada, 88, 90, 91, 92, 96, 97, 98
 Bhatnār, 10, 19, 20, 42, 43, 264
 Bhavānand, 294
 Bhikhan Khan, Sharqī, 139
 Bhūkhan Khan, ■■■ of 'Ālam Khan
 Lodi, 205
 ■■■an Khan, Nūhānī, 212
 Bhongaon, 8, 107, 137, 193
 Bhua, ■■■ Bhua
 Bhūr Singh, 68
 Bibi Matto, mother-in-law of Bahlūl
 Lodi, 135, 270
 ■■■ Matto, ancestress of Afghan, 323
 Bibi Khunza, consort of Husain
 ■■■ Sharqī, 130, 270
 ■■■ Rājī, consort of Mahmūd
 Sharqī, 138, 139, 141, 147, 270
 Bidar, ■■■
 Bihar, 3, 4, 9, 45, 46, 68, 151, 185,
 329
 Bijapur, 62, 240
 Bījānā, 78
 ■■■ Afghan, Malik, 329
 Bodhan Brahman, 191, 193, 314
 Broach, 281
 Būhī, 89
 Bundelkhand, 63
 Būndī, 68
 CALCUT, 281
 Cambay, 278, 281
 Cape Comorin, 281
 Caucasus, 35
 Chaghtāi Khan, Mongol Emperor, 14
 Chaitanya, 293, 305, 307; his prin-
 ciples, 309-10, 314
 Chalgōpāl, disciple of Chaitanya,
 310
 Chambal, 103n.
 Champaner, 65
 Chanderi, 64, 68, 227
 Chandi, Dās, 307
 Chandreshwar, Thakur, 290
 Chandwār, 8, 74, 75, 81, 107, 124, 144,
 167, 185
 Chaplān Malik Agha, consort of
 Timūr, 50
 Chenab, 17, ■■■ 94, 96
 Chingiz Khan, 16, 41
 Chittoor, 67
 Choul, 281
 Christians, 35
 Chunar, 69, 169, 227
 Colgong, 171, 172
 Canningham, 38

- DASHOL, 281
 Dadū Dayāl, 293
 Dahinda, 53
 Dajit Bhatti, of Bhatnir, 10, 21, 22, 53
 Dalmau, 7, 9, 45, 168, 169, 192
 Dalpat Rai, 250
 Dārā Shikoh, 313
 Dardanelles, 15
 Dariya Khan, Lodī, 124, 135, 136, 139, 140, 143, 153, 193, 264
 Dariya Khan, Nūhānī, 166, 172, 187, 200, 213, 214
 Dāūd Khan, 124, 222
 Daulatabad, 275
 Daulat Khan, Indārā, 205
 Daulat Khan, Lodī, 54, 56, 57, 58; declared Sultan of Delhi, 59; imprisoned and killed, 60
 Daulat Khan, Lodī, governor of the Punjab, 180, 207, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 226
 Daulat Timūr Tawāchī, — Timūr Tawāchī
 Daulat Yār Khan, of Kampī, 56
 Daurala, 131
 Delhi, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17; Timūr's march to, 23-27; battle of, 27-29; Sack of, 30-31, 44, 45-54, 56, 59, 61, 63, 67, 68, 69, 76, 95, 115, 122, 123, 130, 139, 144, 146, 148, 153, 161, 166, 169, 174, 187, 197; architecture of, 228-36
 Deoli, 81
 Deopalspur, 9, 10, 12, 16, 19, 20, 21, 40, 42, 71, 85, 89, 98, 100, 121, 133, 219, 220
 Derā Ghāzi Khan, 217
 Dev Rai, of Siwalik, 27, 38
 Deva Rai, son of Rai Sumār, 11
 Daybul, 281
 Dhankot, 16
 Dhankur, 139
 Dhannā, saint, 294, 299
 Dhar, 47, 57n., 77
 Dholpur, 124, 152, 156, 157, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 185
 Dhopaman, 148
 Dilāwar Khan, of Malwa, 45, 47, 62
 Dilāwar Khan, Lodī, son of Daulat Khan Lodī, 215, 220, 221
 Dio, 66
 Doab, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 23, 32, 56, 59, 81, 83, 113, 119
 Dongar Mal, Pandit, Scholar of Persian, 246, 312
 Don Lorenzo, 66
 Dungarpur, 65
 Dugar Singh, Tomar, 49n., 173
 Dwarka, ■
 Egypt, ■
 Eklakhi mosque, 236
 Ekka, 279
 Etah, 7, 149
 Etawah, 7, 8, 9, 47, 52, 75, 78, 79, 81, 82, 113, 121, 129, 144, 145, 151, 156, 164, 176, 185, 273
 FAROHANA, 216
 Farid Khan, brother of Mubārak Saiyyad, 114
 Farid Shakargunj, Shaikh, 20, 264
 Fatehabād, 22, 56, 57
 Fatehgarh, Himachal Pradesh, 87n
 Fateh Khan, son of Firōz Tughlaq, 2
 Fateh Khan, ■ of Muzaffar Gujarati, 94
 Fateh Khan, father of Hamid, 125
 Fateh Khan, ■ ■ Āzam Humayūn Sarwānī, 206, 211
 Fateh Khan, Harwī, 135, 136
 Fateh Khan, ■ of Bahāū Lodī, 162, 200
 Fatehpur, 53n., 73
 Faizād Turkbachchā, 91, 92, 96, 97
 Faizulla Balkhī, 11, 29
 Faizulla, Shaikh, Scholar, 248
 Ferishta, historian, 54, 131
 Firōzābād, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 22, 25, 44, 54, 57, 59, 202

- Firōz Main, see Rai Firōz Main
 Firōzpur, district Muzaffarnagar, 32
 Firōzpur, in Punjab, 76
 Firōz Tughlaq, 1; death of, 1-2,
 5, 6, 7, 12, 37, 40, 52, 55, 70, 71,
 163, 233, 234, 241, 242, 244, 246,
 269, 273

 GADAR RANGES, 37
 Gagraon, 64, 68
 Gakkhar, 85n.
 Ganapati Deva, Tomar, 490.
 Ganga, 32, 34, 35, 48, 73, 78, 79, 101
 Gangotri, 34
 Gangū Khattī, 113
 Garha, 280
 Garhā-Katanga, 207; Appendix D,
 331-34
 Garibdas, saint, 293
 Georgia, 35
 Ghālib Khan, governor of Samana,
 12, 45, 90, 109
 Gharra, 20
 Ghayāsuddin, Sultan of Malwa, 64,
 68, 120
 Ghayāsuddin Tughlaq II, =
 Ghasipur, 200, 235
 Ghazni, 15
 Ghasni Khan, of Malwa, 63
 Ghasniyak, 16
 Gisu-darīz, Khwājā Banda Nawās,
 Sūfī saint, 249
 Gobardhanpur, 33n.
 Golkunda, 62
 Gomti, 168
 Gondwana, 61, 63
 Gublot, Rajputa, 3n.
 Gujer, 27
 Gujarat, 5, 13, 25, 28, 30, 61, 62,
 63, 66, 67, 68, 76, 82, 102, 123, 130;
 architecture of, 238-39, 280
 Gulbarga, 239
 Gūrgān, = Thūr
 Gurgaon, 1
 Gurā Nānak, 194, 293; early life,
 300-01; his teachings, 302-05, 312,
 314
 Gwalior, 10, 49, 68, 74, 75, 79, 83,
 90, 113, 119, 124, 143, 145, 149,
 166, 170, 172, 174, 177, 178;
 conquest of, 205-6; architecture
 of, 235, 236, 245

 HABIB NIYAZI, MALIK, 329
 Hafīzuddin Muhammad, Bazāzī, 41
 [redacted] Khan, Gurgandār, 169, 199,
 200, 203
 Haibat Khan, Jalwānī, 167, [redacted]
 Hāji Dabīr, historian, 18, 120
 Hāji Kar, 94
 Hamid Khan, 118, 125, 126, 133, 160
 Hamūrī, [redacted] of Sesoda, 67
 Hansi, 4, 119
 Hausū Bhattī, [redacted] of Daijī Bhattī,
 91, 94
 Har Singh, Rai, 103
 Hardwar, its history, 34; its attack,
 34, 36, 40
 Harinārāyan, Mahārājādhirāj of Mi-
 thila, 250
 Hasan Khan, Amīr of Rapri, 74
 Hasan Khan, Mewati, 129
 Hasan Khan, Sharqī prince, 140
 Hasan Nizāmī, 249
 Hathkant, 90, 149, 180
 Haus-i-Khās, 2, 8, 27, 28, 29
 Haus-i-Rānī, Gate, 28
 Haus-i-Shamsī, Gate, 28
 Hasāra, temple, 240
 Hazār Sītā, palace of, 30, 241
 Herat, 29
 Himalayas, 35, 36
 Hindola Mahal, 237
 Hindu Kush, 16
 Hindu Shāh, Treasurer of Thūr, 39,
 40
 [redacted] Khan, also called Malik
 Hāji, 117, 118
 Hissār, 121
 Hissār Firōzī, 4, 56, 57, 60, 108, 119

- Hoshang, Shāh of Malwa, 57, 63, 65, 102, 103, 112, 237
- Hoshiyār, 115, 116
- Humayūn Khan, son of Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq II, 3, 5, 8, 10
- Husain Khan Farmūlī, 214, 217
- Husain Khan, brother of [redacted] Lodi, 200
- Husain Shāh, Sharqī, 63, 67: [redacted] cession, 141; [redacted] n., 143, 144; defeated and expelled, 145-53, 155, 165, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 186; his mosque, 235
- Husain Shāh, of Bengal, 171
- Husain Takhir, Shaikh, Scholar, 244
- IBN BATTUTA, 241, 257, 265, 266, 274, 275, 287, 290
- Ibn Rasūl, Saiyyad, musician, 243
- Ibrāhīm Khan, son of Mubārak Khan Nūhānī, 106, 107, 156
- Ibrāhīm Lodi, 61, 66, 195, 197: coronation, 198; fights Jalāl Khan, 199-205; conquest of Gwalior, 205-9; wars with Rana Sāngā, 209-11, 214, 215, 219, 220, 221; fights Bābūr at Panipat, 222-23; death and estimate, 225-26, 229, 230, 233, 258, 262, 264
- Ibrāhīm Sharqī, 48, 50, 55, 56, 60, 69, 83, 106, 108, 119, 234, 235, 249
- Idar, 65, 66, 77
- Idris, Malik, 58, 59
- Iktiyār Khan, governor of Fīrōzābād, 54, 57, 59, 73, 79
- Ilāh Dīya, Jaunpuri, Scholar, 245, 249
- Ilkārī, 133
- Ilīyās Khan, governor of Jhām, 77
- Imuddīn, Saiyyad, 53, 264
- Itutmish, 1, 328
- Ilyās Khan, Afghan, of Meerut, 31, 32, 33, 43
- Imādul Mulk, title of, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 100, 109, 131, 139, 182
- Indarāb, 16
- Indulākhā, poetess, 268
- Indus, 12, 15, 16
- Iqbāl Khan, [redacted] Mullā Iqbāl Khan
- Iqbāl Khan, cavalry commander of Āzam Humayūn, 212
- Iqbāl Khan, ruler of Barī, 152, 156, 264
- Iqlīm Khan, also known [redacted] Kailash, [redacted] of Bahādur Nāhar, 310, 54, 58, 60
- 'Isa Khan, Turkbachchā, 124
- 'Isa Khan, Lodi, 125, 137, 163, 164
- Ishwar Puri, 308
- Islām Khan, Vazīr of Sultan Muhammad, 5, 7
- Islām Khan, son of Āzam Humayūn, 211, 213, 225, 264
- Islām Khan, Lodi, 53, 90, 91, 92, 97, 98, 117, 160
- Ismail Khan, Nūhānī, 164, [redacted]
- JAGAT MADHAI, DISCIPLE OF CHAITANYA, 310
- Jahangīr, Mughal Emperor, 37
- Jahān Malik, officer of Timūr, 21
- Jahān Numā, [redacted]
- Jahanpanāh, 25, 29, 31, 48
- Jahār Mahal, 237
- Jahata, [redacted]
- Jahwal, 19
- Jai Mal, 68
- Jainī, [redacted] Muhammad, 269, 279, 312, 331
- Jājū, nephew of Islām Khan, 7
- Jalālī, 148, 156n.
- Jalāl Khan, Lodi, son [redacted] Mahmūd Lodi and governor of Kalpi, 179
- Jalāl Khan, Lodi, son of Sikandar Lodi, 139, 142, 179, 195, 197, 199, 200, 201, 202, 209, 207, 332 (also Sultan designate of Jaunpur [redacted] Jalāluddīn)
- Jalāl Khan, Sharqī prince, 141, 142
- Jalāl Khan, Mewati, 60, 104, 108, 109

- Jalāluddīn Haqq, Saiyyad, 53
 Jalāluddīn Khwarizm Shāh, 16, 328
 Jalāluddīn Muhammad Shāh, of Bengal, 236
 Jalandhar, 3, 10, 78n., 81, 88, 93, 96, 110, 129
 Jalbahar, Rai, 52
 Jalor, 66
 Jalesar, 3, 4, 7, 8, 74, 167
 Jamāl Khan Dohli, 245
 Jama' Masjid, Delhi, 29, 30, 40
 Jām Nizāmuddīn, 65
 Jammu, 10, 36, 39, 56, 321
 Janjan, 18, 19
 Jāran-Manjūr, 93 & n.
 Jartoli, 107, 203
 Jasrat Khokhar, 18, 40, 81, 84; early career, 85; helps in Kashmir war, 86, ■; rebels against the Sultanate, 87, 90; invites foreign aid, 96-7, 101, 109, 110, 117, 118; death, 121-22; his stronghold, Appendix B, 321-22
 Jauhar, 32, 43; custom of, 269, 270, 289
 Jaunpur, early history, 9n., 25, 45, 48, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 82, 83, 101, 102, 113, 129, 140, 145, 149, 150, 151, 164, 166, 167, 169, 173, 185, 200, 202; end of the kingdom, 145-53; architecture, 234-35, 236, 238
 Jayadeva, poet, 307
 Jayasthambha, at Chittor, 67
 Jeziya, 188, 289
 Jhain, 82
 Jhalawar, 77
 Jhān Rani, 300
 Jhang-Maghlana, 85n.
 Jhaujhi Masjid, 234, 235
 Jhelum, 17
 Jonraja, 246
 Joga, 168
 Jumna, 23, 25, 32, 73, 85, 86, ■ 107, 108, 112, 115, 116, 149
 Junagarh, 65
 Jūna Khan, 140
 Jwālā Mukhī temple, 37
 KANIN, SANT, 194, 293, 294; his philosophy, 295-98; exiled to Maghar, ■ 300, 303, 304, 305, 313, 314
 Kabul, 15, 44, 92, 95, 102, 117, 217
 Kahun, Raj, 97
 Kalash, see Iqīm Khan
 Kaithal, ■
 Kālā Lodi, see Allahabad Kālā Lodi
 Kālābāgh, 16
 Kalansur, 89, 90, 109
 Kālā Pahār, see Muhammad Khan Farmūl
 Kali Nadi, or Rahāb, 46, 74, 75, 79, 107, 150, 153, 163n.
 Kalpi, 45, 60, 63, 64, 106, 112, 129, 149, 150, 152, 155, 162, 164, 169, 174, 179, 198, 200, 202, 203, 235
 Kalyan Singh, ■ Mal, of Gwalior, 49n., 146, 155, 173
 Kamāluddīn, 91, 92, 100, 109, 110, 111, 115, 116
 Kamāluddīn Maṭn, of Ludhiana, 3, 10, 21, 53
 Kamālul Mulk, also Kamāl Khan, officer of Mubārak Saiyyad, see Kamāluddīn
 Kamaū, son of Visadru, architect, 235
 Kambol, Village, 6
 Kampil, 9, 74, 148
 Kandil, village, ■
 Kaner, 191
 Kangra, 37, 96
 Kantit, 169, 170
 Kapil, sage, 34
 Kapileshwar Deva, Raja of Orissa, 145
 Kara, ■
 Karanwati, 65
 Karauli, 177
 Kartmādā Taugh, 205

- Karimul ■■■ Anhadī, 77
 Kashmir, 16, 37, 85
 Katak, 31
 Katchar, 45, 68n., 73, 75, 79, 82, 83, 101, 129
 Katchriya Rajputs, 73
 Katoch, Rajas of Kangra, 37
 Khagar, river, 23
 Khairuddin of Tuhfa, 73, 80, 81, 93, 101, 102, 105
 Khalgaon, 227
 Khalil Sultan, ■
 Khalis Khatoli, 20
 Khalis Mukhalla, 234
 Khandesh, 61, 66
 Khandu, ■ ■ 'Adil Khan
 Khan-i-Jahan Nuhānī, 198
 Khan-i-Jahan Tala'ānī, Prime Minister of Firōz Shāh, 228
 Khanzadas of Mawat, 119
 Kharan Ghati, 170
 Kharar, village, 118n.
 Kharol, 59
 Khatibpur, 93, 96
 Khatoli, 210
 Khawā Khan, governor ■ Bihar, 3, 4, 174, 247
 Khirs Khan, 3, 12, 40, 42, 45, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 69; early career, 70; ancestry, 71-72; ■ Sultan, 73-82; resume of his work, 82-3, 84, 107, 110, 129, 131, 132, 183
 Khwājā Abubagha, 28
 Khwājā Ahmad, 183
 Khwājā Babban, 174
 Khwājā Bayand, 134, 135, 152, 162, 164, 264
 Khwājā Jahān, Malik Sarwar, 2, 3, 7; becomes Malikul Sharq, 9, 10, 25, 45, 46, 68, 73
 Khwājā Khizr, ford of, ■
 Khwājā Muhammad, 20, 166
 Khwājā Mu'Inuddin Ajmeri, 248
 Khor, 9, 74n.
 Khokhars, 113
 Khudadād, son of Malhū Iqbāl Khan, 28
 Khulm, 16
 Khurasan, 12
 Khusru Kokaltash, officer of Bābur, 223
 Khusrubad, 94
 Khyber Pass, 217, 219
 Kiara Sahab, 307
 Kichcha, ford of, 115, 147
 Kirti Singh, of Gwallor, 49n., 146, 173
 Kirtistambha, ■ Chittor, 67
 Kohat, 217
 Kohila, 87
 Kol, 9, 46, 54, 68, 81, 124, 137, 145, 148, 163
 Krishana Dēvarāya, 240, 243, 305
 Kuhram, 114
 Kumaon hills, 103
 Kumbalgarh, 66, 67
 Kumbha, see Rana Kumbha
 Kupila, 34
 Kurukshetra, 166
 Kutch, 65

 LABAYER, ■
 Lahore, 4, 8, 10, 12, 18, 39, 40, 71, 93, 95, 96, 100, 121, 129, 133, 219
 Lakhman Bhatta, Telingana Brab- ■ 305
 Lakhnor, see Lucknow
 Lakhmi, poetess, 268
 Lakhmi Chand, of Bandūgarh, 171
 ■ Chand, ■ of Gurū Nānak, ■
 ■ Darwāzā, Mas'ūd, 234, 235
 Lodis, 1, 129, 130; origin of the Lodis, Appendix C, 323-30;
 Lohang, musician, 243
 Lōnī, 23
 Lucknow or Lakhnor, 47, 191, 193, 200, 202, 203
 Ludhiana, 93, 129, 142

- MACHCHIWARA**, Son.
Madan Mahal, Gond palace fort, 280, 332
Madan Singh, King of Gorakhpur and Champaran, 257
Madanpal, King of Keshtha, 251
Mahābat Khan, governor of Badaon, 59, 74, 79, 81, 101
Mahdi Khwājā, brother-in-law of Bābur, 223, 226
Mahindwari, 8
Mahmūdābād, town, 239
Mahmūd Baghara, of Gujarat, 65, 66, 239
Mahmūd Gharot, 37, 42
Mahmūd Hasan, officer of Mubārak Saiyyad, 87, 88, 95, 102, 105; appointed governor of Bayana, 108; given title of Imāduṣṣalṭ, 109. ■
Mahmūd Khan, Lodi, 165, 224
Mahmūd Khan, son of Malīkzāda Firōz, 45
Mahmūd Khan, Uncle of Bābur, 216
Mahmūd Khalji I, of Malwa, 63, 64; invited to Delhi, 119, 120, 125, 130, 133, 146
Mahmūd Khalji II, of Malwa, 66, 205, 207, 209, 222, 237
Mahmūd Sharqi, of Jaunpur, 69, 125, 134; attacks Delhi, 135-37, 138; death, 139, 153; architecture, 235, 238
Mahmūd Tarmatī, Malik, 55
Mahoba, town, 60n.
Maholi, town, 123
Mahuan, 273, 278, 281
Mainpuri, town, ■
Majhauri, town, 151
Makhdūma-i-Jahān, mother of Mubārak Saiyyad, 97, 238
Malik Abdur Rahīm, adopted son of Malik Sulaiman, 73
Malik Ādam, Kakar, 203, 204
Malik 'Alāuddīn, officer of Sikandar Lodi, 178
■ 'Alī, Gujarati, officer of Jaunpur, 141
Malik Asghar, governor of Delhi under Sikandar Lodi, 189
Malik Badhan, governor of Sarhind, 77
Malik Dāūd, 76
Malik Firōz, son of Behrām Lodi, 191
Malik Hādī, 26
■ Hājī, see Hīgām Khan
Malik Isma'īl, nephew of Zīrak Khan, 98
■ Kālū, see Alīahādād Kālā Lodi
Malik Kartmul, Mulk Auhādī, 75
■ Khaurāj, Mubārak Khan, 117
Malik Khwājā, 131
Malik Khizr Lodi, 329
Malik Lona, 60
Malik Raja, son of Bahār Khan, 98
Malik Sarwar, see Khwājā Jahān
■ Tājuddīn Kanbūh, 178
■ Ziyāul Mulk, see Ziyāul Mulk
Malkot, town, 221
Mallū Iqbāl Khan, 10, 11, 13, 15, 24, 25, 27, 28, 41, 44, 44-52; death, 53; estimate, 53-54, 55, 57n., 59, 60, 69, 71, 82, 131, 228, 263
■ Sabeb, Sikh pilgrimage centre, 301
Malwa, 47, 61, 64, 66, 67, 68, 113, 123, 129
Mandaki, river, 175 & n.
Mandrol, town, 180, 227
Mandu, 62, 63, 120, 191; architecture of, 237, 238
Mangalore, 281
Mangli Khwājā, general of Timūr, 27
Manjhan, Sōfī poet, 312
Mān Singh, Raja of Gwalior, 49n., 155, 166, 170, 173, 177, 178, 179, 193, 205, 235-242, 312
Mann, 268
■ Polo, 278
Mardan Daulat, Malik Nasirul Mulk, 70, 131

- Marchra, 167
 Marhaba, Malik, governor of []
 on behalf of Ibrāhīm Sharqi, 57
 Marula, poetess, 268
 Marwat, 96 & n.
 Maulana Nūraddīn, Sikanders' envoy
 of Tīmūr, 38
 Mayapur, 36 & n.
 Medini Rai, Rajput Vazir of Malwa,
 64, 181, 209
 Meerut, 5, 31, 32, 42
 Megha, Raja of Kangra, 37
 Meo (S), 27
 Mesopotamia, 33
 Mathura, 191, 245
 Mewar, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 154
 Mewat, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 25, 46, 58, 81,
 83, 129, 137
 Mewatis, 103, 104, 108, 113
 Mian 'Abdulla, of Ajodhan, 166, 194
 Mian Bhikan, [] of Mojāhid Khan,
 178
 Mian Bhiā, son of Khawās Khan,
 Prime Minister of Sikandar Lodi,
 188, 189, 190, 207, 208, 212, 232,
 247
 Mian Husain, Lodi general, 209, 210,
 211
 Mian Hatim Sambālī, 245
 Mian Ladhan, 245
 Mian Makhan, 176, []
 Mian Malik, 187, 188
 Mian Mustafa, 215
 Mian Saiyyad, of Badaon, 245
 Mian Shaikh, of Gwalior, 245
 Mian Tāh, Lodi general, 211n.
 Mian Tāh, artist, 178
 Milauli, town, 156n., 162
 Mir 'Alī, see 'Alī Malik [] Uchch
 Mir Khwānd, historian, 33, 319
 Mirān Sadr, 111, 112, 113, 114;
 death of, 116
 Mīsarū Mīra, Sanskrit Scholar, 250
 Miyan Chaman, 115, 116
 Mongols, 3n., 24
 Montgomery dist., 98
 Moreland, 182
 Morika, poetess, 268
 Moscow, 15
 Moth ki Masjid, 232
 Mubārakābād, township named after
 Mubārak Saiyyad, 88, 112
 Mubārak Gung, officer [] Jaunpur,
 141
 Mubārak Khan, Lodi, 147, 183, 193,
 219
 Mubārak Khan, Mujikhalī, 169,
 170, 189
 [] Khan, Nūhānī, 149, 151,
 156, 165, 168, 186
 Mubārak Khan, general of Tīmūr, 31
 Mubārak Khan, uncle [] Ahmad
 Khan Mewati, 137
 Mubārak Khan, governor of Sambhal
 and son of Tātār Khan, 147
 Mubārak Shāh (also Qaranfūl),
 Sharqi, 45, 46, 47, 48, 69, 134,
 138
 Mubārak Shāh, Saiyyad, Sultan of
 Delhi, 63; as prince, 75, 76;
 accession, 84; fights Jasrat Kho-
 khar, 86-89, 90, 92, 95, 96, 97,
 [] 101-03, 105, 106, 107, 109;
 murdered, 113, 129, 243, 263,
 321, 322
 Mubārīz Khan, brother of Idrīs the
 governor of Rohtak, 58, 60, 106
 Mubāsīr Khan, Malwa noble, 181,
 182, 209, 239
 Muhammad 'Alī Jang-Jang, 223
 Muhammad Ghori, 1, 64, 277
 Muhammad Khan, Auhadī, 102, 103,
 106, 107, 108
 Muhammad Khan, Fārmūllī, also
 known as Kālā Pahār, 165, []
 Muhammad [] Saiyyad, 114;
 second coronation, 116; repulses
 attack from Malwa, 119-20; death,
 122, 129, 132, 133, 134, 136, 228,
 229, 230
 Muhammad Shāh, Sultan of the
 East, 214, 215

- Muhammad Shāh, Sharqī, 140, 141, 153
 Muhammad Tughlaq I, 1, 260n.
 Muhammad Shāh Tughlaq II, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 50, 170
 Muḥmuddīn, officer of Sultan Mahmūd, 26, 27
 Mujāhid Khan, 178
 Mulla Hasan Naqshī, 248
 Mulla Muhammad, Mazhab, envoy of Bābur, 221
 Mulla Fasin, 161
 Multan, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 40, 47, 50, 53, 54, 71, 73, 96, 119, 134, 144
 Mung, 23
 Muqarrab Khan, governor of Jalesar, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13
 Muqbil Khan, of Bayana, 105
 Murārī Gupta, disciple of Chaitanya, 308
 Muṣṣfir Kabūlī, Timuride governor, 19, 21, 222
 Mustafā, artillery commander ■ Bābur, 222, 223
 Muzaḥḥar, nephew of Shaikh, 'Aḥ, 94, 95, 111
 Muzaḥḥarnagar, town, 33n.
 Muzaḥḥar Shāh, of Gujarat, 50, 51, 64, 65, 94, 238

 NADIA OR NAWADWĪ, 307
 Nagarkot, town, 1, 2, 3, 37, 76
 Nagh, 16
 Nagor, town, 66, 76, 77, 119, 185, 227
 Najmuddīn, Saiyyad, ■
 Nāndēva, Maharashtra Saint, ■
 Nānak, ■ Gurū Nānak
 Narela, town, 136
 Narhari, Saint, 294
 Nārang, ford of, 108
 Narnaul, town, 58, 108, 114
 Narsingh Rai, son of Pratap Singh, 143
 Narvīr Vāhan, ■
 Narwar, town, 64, 177, 180, 227, 245
 Nāṣir Khan, Nūhānī of Ghazipur, 213, 215
 Nāṣiruddīn Chirāgh-i-Delhi, Shaikh, 291
 Nāṣiruddīn Khaljī, of Malwa, 64, 237
 Nāṣiruddīn Mahmūd, ■ Tughlaq, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 38, 41, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 58, 60, 62, 69, 72, 79
 Nāṣiruddīn Nusrat, Shāh Tughlaq, 11, 12, 13, 32, 40, ■
 Nāṣiruddīn 'Umar, Maulana, 24, 29
 Nusrat Khan, Gurgandāz, 97, 103
 Nāyak Bhikshū, musician, 243
 Neherwala, 6
 Ni'amat Khatūn, 270
 Ni'amatulla, historian, 132, 134, 146, 174, 199, 203, 207
 Nicolo Conti, 257, 272, 281
 Nihāl, 174
 Nimā, mother of Kabīr, 294
 Nimṣar Miṣrik, also called Nīmkhār, place of pilgrimage, 154
 Nirū, father of Kabīr, 294
 Nizām Khan (name of Sikandar Lodī as prince), 162, 163
 Nizām Shāh, governor of Gujarat, 6
 Nizām Shāh, Bahmanī, 65
 Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, historian, 152, 182, 188, 193, 197, 319
 Nizāmuddīn Awliyā, Shaikh, 270, 276, 287, 291
 Nūb, 5, 45
 Nūhānī, 197
 Nuniz, 240
 Nūr Jahān, 33n.
 Nūr Nagar, 33n.
 Nūru'l Haqq, 248

 ORISSA, 1, 61, 69, 310

 PADMAŚRĪ, poetess, 268

- Padmāvatī, disciple of Rāmānanda, 294
 Pakistan, 313
 Palam, 124
 Palla, 13
 Panipat, 1, 4, 11, 13, 123, 133, 119;
 battle of, 122-26
 Pāndvi, musician, 243
 Panja Sahib, Sikh pilgrimage centre, 301
 Pardi, near Daman, 65
 Parhala, 321
 Patan, 50
 Patiali, 46, 148, 164
 Pipā, Raja and Saint, 294, 299
 Pir Muhammad, grandson of Timūr,
 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 26,
 27, 40
 Pithora, 137n.
 Prakāśhānand, Saraswati, 308
 Pratap Rudra, King of Orissa, 310
 Pratap Singh, Raja of Bhongau, 124,
 125, 137, 138, 240, 142, 153, 193,
 289
 Prithvirāj, son of Rai Mal, 68
 Priya Bhatta, 247
 Portuguese, 66, 67, 282
 Punjab, 1, 4, 5, 13, 25, 45, 61, 82,
 101, 109, 110, 113, 117, 129, 133,
 157
 QADIR KHAN, see 'ABDUL QADIR
 Qadr Khan, Prince of Malwa, 120
 Qadr Khan, grandson ■ Bahadur
 Nāhar, 103, 104, 105
 Qamaruddin, 177
 Qandhar, 15
 Qannauj, 1, 7, 8, 9, 45, 46, 48, 49,
 52, 54, 55, 56, 69, 140, 141, 150, 212
 Qansu Ghorī, the Sultan of Egypt, ■
 Qarāchar Nūyān, 14
 Qaranfūl, see Mubārak Shāh Sharqi
 Qāim Khan, 203
 Qasr-i-Hazār Sitūn, ■ Hazār Sitūn
 Qasr, 92
 Qawām Khan, 57, 79
 Qazi 'Abdus Samad, 111
 Qazi Fiyāz, 191
 Qazi Shihābuddin, 249
 Qil'a Kuhna Masjid, 232
 Quilon, 281
 Qundūr, 15
 Qothan, Sōfi poet, 512
 Qutb Khan, Afghan of Rapri, 124,
 142, 153, 329
 Qutb Khan, Sharqi prince, 140 & n.
 Qutb Khan Lodi, 117, 125, 126, 132,
 136, 140, 142, 144, 147, 148, 151
 Qutbuddin Aibak, 1
 Qutbuddin Mahmūd, Langah, 144
 Qutlugh Khan, 163, 165
 Qawwatul-Islam, mosque, 231
 RAGHAVANANDA, 293
 Raghunandan Misra, of Bengal, 251
 Rahāb, see Kali Nadi
 Rai, Bahroz of Siwalik, 36n., 37
 Rai Dandū, 149, 156
 Raidās, or Ravidās, saint, 293, 294.
 ■■■
 ■■■ Dāūd, of Jalandhar, 10, 53, 222
 Rai Firōz Main, 86, 89, 92, 96, 97
 Rai Ganesah, 164
 Rai Karan, of Shamsabad, 137, 140
 Rai Mal, 68, 154
 Raisen, 64. ■■■
 Rai Sehra, Langah, 143
 Rai Ugra Sen Khichi, 183
 Rāj Singh Kachchwāhā, 179
 Raja Bhēdchandra, Beghola of Rowa,
 150, 168, 169, 170
 Raja Bhtn, of Jammu, 88, 89, 289
 Rajgarh, 141. ■ n.
 Rajjab Nādira, Malik, 89, 109
 Rajōn Ki Baoli, 233
 Rajouri, 86
 Rajputana, also Rajasthan, 41, 62,
 67, 76, 82, 153, 240
 Rāmānanda, 293; his disciples, 284,
 299

- Rāmānuja, 291, 293
 Rampura, 68, 193n.
 Rāma Raya, 243
 Rānā Sāngā, also Sangrām Singh,
 64, 68, 209, 210, 211, 219, 221, 289
 Rānā Kumbha, 63, 67, 240
 Ranthambhor, 63, 167
 Rānū, 113
 Ranvir Vāhan, of Mainpuri, ■
 Rapri, 46, 74, 90, 108, 124, 137, 140,
 148, 164, 174
 Ratan Singh, of Siwalik, 37
 Ravi, river, 18, 88, 93, 96
 Rewari, 58
 Rīzqullā see Shaikh Rīzqullā
 Roh, 126, 137, 159
 Rohilkhand, 73
 Rohtak, 11, 58
 Rori Sahab, place of Sikh pilgrimage,
 301
 Ruknuddīn Bārbak Shāh, of Bengal,
 237
 Rūpar, 80, 87, 88
 Rūpmati, of Sarangpur, 64n.
 Rūpnārayan, of Mithila, 230
 Rushbrook Williams, 61
 Rustam, Timuride prince, 26, 27
- Sa'ADAT KHAN, BĀRBĀK ■ MAHRŪD
 Tughlaq, 10, 11, 12
 Sa'āduddīn, Shaikh of Ajodhan, 20,
 43
 Sa'āduddīn, Khairabādī, 249
 Sabzwār, 14
 Sadhāran Gangū, 113, 115, 116
 Sadrū Nādīra, Malik, 76
 Saffi, 31, 32, 33
 Saharanpur, ■ & n., 73
 Sāhib Khan, Malwa prince, 181,
 182
 Sahiwal, 98
 Sahib-i-Qirān, see Tīmūr
 Sa'id Khan, governor of Avadh, 202,
 212, 213
 Saif Khan, of Multan, 166
- Saifuddīn, ■ of Mallū Iqbāl Khan,
 4, 28
 Saifuddīn, Firōz Shāh II, of Bengal,
 237
 Sain, saint, 294
 Saiyyad Dynasty, 3, 101; resume ■
 its work, 118-30
 Saiyyad, Ibn Rasūl, 243
 Saiyyad Khan, son of Saiyyad
 Sālim of Bhatinda, 115
 Saiyyad Khwājā, 21, 24, 27
 Saiyyad Rūhullā, musician, 243
 Saiyyad Sālim, of Barah, 73n.
 Saiyyad Sālim, of Bhatinda, 88, 90,
 91, 109, 115
 Saiyyad Shamsuddīn, 136, 264
 Salār Shāh, brother of Ghayāsuddīn
 Tughlaq II, 2
 Salivāhan, prince of Bhatghora, 171,
 172
 Samana, 3, 4, 19, 45, 52, 55, 56, 81,
 82, 87, 94, 97, 98, 117
 Samangan, 16
 Samarqand, 14, 16, 29, 39, 40, 42,
 85, 121, 228
 Sarabhal, 11, 56, 57, 79, 115, 129,
 130, 146, 166, 191, 193, 203
 Samathala, 10
 Sandilāh, 9, 45
 Sangrām Shāh, Gond king, 207
 Sangrām Singh, see Rana Sanga
 Sanjak Bahadur, noble of Tīmūr, 24,
 27
 Saket, 74, 137, 148, 167
 Sant Ghāt, 301
 Saragdwari, lord of, 74
 ■ Lado, 123
 Sarai Lashkar, 145
 Sarang Khan, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19,
 ■ 30, 32, 80
 Sarangpur, 64
 Sarhind, 76, 80, 87, 88, 117, 118,
 122, 129, 131, 132, 147
 Sarkhej, 238, 239
 Sarwanis, Afghan tribe, 197
 Sarwarul Mulk, Vazīr of Mubārak

- Saiyyad, 91, 94, 96, 97, 98, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 114; death, 116, 263
 Satī, custom of, 270
 Sehwal, 19
 Seorī, 74
 Shahabad, 193
 Shah 'Alam, see 'Alāuddīn 'Ālam Shāh
 Shah nawaz, 18
 Shahpur, 18
 ■■■ Rukh, successor of Timūr, 71, 84, 93n.
 Shāhī Khan, see Zainul Ābidīn
 Shaikh Abu Lāl, of Rapri, 106
 Shaikh Ahmad, Khattū (Khattī), 40, 238, 264
 Shaikh 'Alī, of Kabul, 89, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97-100, 102, 109, 111, 113, 117, 132, 134
 Shaikh Arsalān, officer of Timūr, 26
 Shaikh Badr, 191
 Shaikh Bahāuddīn, Zakaria, 134
 Shaikh Hussain, Tāhir, 244
 Shaikh Hosain, Zanjānī, 88 & n., 166
 Shaikh Jamāl, 183, 248
 Shaikh Mubārak, Saiyyad, 239
 Shaikh Munawwar, 20
 Shaikh Rīzqullā, Mushtāqī, historian and poet, 163n., 243, 246
 Shaikh Safruddīn, 120, 264
 Shaikh Shamsuddīn, 248
 Shaikha Khokhar, 8, 10, 12, 18, 33, 39, 40, 84, 121
 Shaikhū, a relation of Shaikha Khokhar, 37
 Shaikhsādā Manjhu, 205
 Shaikhsādā Mubammad Fārmūlī, 146, 203, 213
 Shaikh Zain, historian, 68
 Shamsabad, 138, 139, 142, 143, 148, 157, 164
 Shams Khan, Auhadī, 12, 43, 46, 47, 51, 71, 75, 77, 167
 Shams Khan, Vazīr of Tātār Khan of Gujarat, 51
 Shams Khātūn, 139, 270
 Shams Sirāj 'Affī, ■■■ 'Affī
 Shamsuddīn, Jaunpur Vazīr, 148
 Shaktī Singh, ■■■ of Rāt Dandū, 156
 Shankaracharya, 291
 Sharafuddīn Yazdī, see Yazdī
 Sharaf Khan, Malwa noble, 181
 Shar Khan, governor of Chanderī, 167
 Shihāb Khan Mewatī, 44
 Shihāb Nāhar, ■■■
 Shihābuddīn Mubārak, Tamīmī, 17
 Shihābuddīn, Malwa prince, 181, 182
 Shīrāz, 29
 Shorkot, 17, 94, 95, 99
 Shuka, pupil of Priya Bhattī, 247
 Sialkot, 85, 86
 Sīdh Pāl, 113
 Sīdī Saiyyad, his mosque, 239
 Sikandar Lodī, 63, 66, 139, 166, 172, 173, 181, 194, 210; accession, 163; suppression of rivals, 164-66; fights Bachgotīs, 167-69; and Baghelas of Rewa, 169-72; attacks Tomars of Gwalior, 173-80; relations with Malwa, 180-84; estimate, 185-90; his bigotry, 191-94, 209, 218-30, 232, 233, 241, 243-45, 247, 248, 262, 269, 291, 299, 313
 Sikandar Shāh, son of Muhammad Tughlaq II, 8, 163, 165
 Sikandar Shāh, of Kashmir, 16, 38, 39, 75, 85, 167, 168, 170, 194n.
 Sikandar Tuhfa, Vazīr of Khizr Khan, 57, 82, 87, 88, 89, 90, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 107, 109, 110, 118
 Sīkri, 68
 Sīlahdī, ruler of Raisen, 64
 Sindh, 45, 52, 61, 153
 Sīnor, 51
 Sīrī, city founded by 'Alāuddīn Khālījī, 11, 25, 31, 45, ■■■
 Sirmur, hill town, 2
 Sīrā, 140 & n.
 Sīrsūtī, 90
 Sīwalik hills, 36, 37

- Siyāh Poshek, 16
 Sonhar, 149 ■ n., 17
 Sri Chand, son of Gurū Nānak, 300
 Srinagar, 39, 85
 Srivara, disciple of Jonarāja, a
 Scholar, 247
 Subhadrā, poetess, 268
 Suket, ■
 Sulākhin, wife of Gurū Nānak, 300
 Sultan Husain, Timuride prince, 26,
 27
 Sultan Hussain Tawāchī, general of
 Timūr, 30
 Sultan Shah Lodi, 80, 88, 93, 129, 131
 Sultan Sharf, ■ of Ahmad Khan
 Jalwānī, 167
 Sumer, Rai of Etawah, 3, 6, 7, ■,
 47, 52, 75, 78, 81, 101
 Sunam, 98, 121
 Surat, 65
 Sursura, 294
 Sutlej, 10, 13, 93

 TABRIZ, 29
 Taghī Khan, 26, 27
 Taghīnā (Nagīnā) Khātūn, mother of
 Timūr, 14
 Tājuddin, deputy of Sārang Khan,
 13
 Tājul Mulk Tuhfa, Vazīr of Khizr
 Khan, 72, 73, 74, 75, 79, 81, 82,
 83, 110, 130
 Tank (or Tak) clan, 65
 Taiwandi, 53, 86, 98, 300
 Talwara (on slopes of Kashmir),
 also called Tilhar, 88, 89, 93, 321-22
 Tappal, 45 ■ n.
 Tapti, 61
 Taratama, 13
 Tarmashīrīn Khan, 24, 32
 Tashkent, 217
 Tātār Khan, governor of Jahtara,
 147, 163, 166
 Tātār Khan, son of Muzaffar Gujara-
 tī, 11, 12, 13, 50, 51, 65
 Tātār Khan, of Lahore, 166, 215a.
 Thana, 281
 Thatta, 1
 Tījara, 58, 104, 109
 Tilwara, opposite Deopulpur, 95
 Timūr, Amir, Gūrgān, 1, 2, 12, 13;
 march into Hindustan, 16; through
 the Punjab, 17-23; defeats Sultan
 Mahmūd, 23-29; sacks Delhi, 30,
 44, 45, 49-51; in Moorut and
 Hardwar, 31, 34; return journey,
 35-41; effects of his invasion, 41,
 43; death, 52, 53, 59, 61, 62, 64,
 69, 71, 85, 93, 104, 121, 130, 190,
 193, 216, 227, 228; Massacre of
 Indian prisoners, Appendix A,
 319-20
 Timūr Tawāchī, commander of
 Timūr, 19, 27
 Tīrbara, village in Ludhiana district,
 10, 93
 Tīrhat, 9, 46, 68, 185, 172
 Turmiz, 16
 Todah, 77
 Tohana, 22
 Tonga, 279
 Tomar Rajas of Gwalior, geneological
 table, 49n.
 Transoxiana, 14
 Trilok Chand, Raja of Bagesar, 150,
 193
 Tughān Rāis, 76, 80, 81, 86, 87
 Tughlaqqar, 23, 33
 Tulmaha, 13, 17, 20, 25, 42, 85, 93,
 96, 99

 UCHER, 13, 15, 17, 134
 Udaya of Mewar, 68
 Udhāran Singh, Rawat, 6, 7, ■
 Uditnagar ■ Utgir, ■ Avantgarh
 Ujjain, 156
 'Umar Khan Sarwānī, 162, 167,
 169
 'Umar Shaikh, Mirrā, father of
 Bābur, 216

- 'Umar Yahiyā, 244
 'Usmān Farīmūh, 183
 Ustād 'Alī, commander of Bābur, 221, 223
 Uttar Pradesh, 7, 46, 101, 109, 113, 135, 157
- VACHASPATI MISHRA, SANSKRIT SCHOLAR, 250
 Vadnagar, ■
 Vahārākya Deva, 170
 Vallabhacharya, 305; his teachings, 306
 Varanasi, 145, 234, 235
 Vasco da Gama, 66, 281, 282
 Vidisha (Bhilsa), 64
 Vidyāpati, 269, 287, 307
 Vijāya Chandra Dēva, Raja of Varanasi, 234
 Vijāyanagar, 61, 240, 280
 Vijjā, poetess, 268
 Vikramāditya, son of ■ Singh of Gwalior, 135, 175, 206 & n.
 Vināyak Deva, 174, 175
 Vira Singh, of Gwalior, 6, 7, 8, 45, 49, 173
 Virama Deva, ancestor of Bhād-chandra of Rewa, 169
 Virama Deva, of Gwalior, 490., 52
 Vīram Singh, of Kāthar, 59, 73, 75, 77, 78
 Vīṭṭhalwāmi, temple of, 240
- WAJINUL MULK, FATHER OF ZAFAR Khan Gujarati, 6, 45
 Wassāf, 278, 281
 Wellington Aerodrome, 25
- YAHYA SAREINDI, HISTORIAN, 12, 38, 72, 94, 116, 319, 320
 Yasdi, Sharafuddin, historian, 26, 32, 34, 37, 319, 320
 Yūsuf Hindwi, 119
 Yūsuf, Malik, son of Sarwarul Mulk, 91, 94, 98, 110, 115
 Yūsuf Khan, Auhadi, 114, 145
 Yūsuf Qattāl, Shaikh, 213 ■ n., 264
 Yūsuf Qureshi, Shaikh, ruler of Multan, 134, 143, 144
 Yūsuf Sarwānī, Malik, 329
- ZAFAR KHAN, SON ■ FIRŌZ TUḠLAQ, 2, 6, 7
 Zafar Khan, Gujarati, 6, 7, 45, 56-7, 64
 Zainuddin, 39
 Zainul Ābidīn (Shāhī Khan as prince) of Kashmir, 85, 86, 246
 Zāhir Dehlvi, poet, 247
 Zeba, wife of Bahlūl Lodī, 162 & n.
 Zīrak Khan, ruler of Samana, 76, 77, 80, 81, 83, 86, 87, 90, 91, 94
 Ziyāuddin Baranī, historian, 258, 269, 273, 287
 Ziyānī Mulk, Malik, 3

D.G.A. 80.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY,
NEW DELHI

Call No.— 954.022 Kis

Acc. No.— 36584

Author—

Title— *Two light of the Sultans*

Borrower's Name

Date of Issue

Date of Return

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.

W. S. 143. 10. 1951